

THE
**SOCIALIST
STANDARD**

1935

THE SOCIALIST STANDARD

The Official Organ of **THE SOCIALIST PARTY** of Great Britain.

Socialism, the aim of the disinherited, requires much of its advocates but offers them a rich achievement—a world free of economic oppression.

No. 365. Vol. 32]

London, January, 1935

[Monthly, Twopence

Which Way is Roosevelt Heading?

From May, 1933, to August, 1934, more than two billion dollars have been spent by the American capitalist class to finance its various unemployment relief plans. Burdened with the weight of these relief measures the American capitalists may be forced to seek another and more efficient method—unemployment insurance.

The first unemployment insurance bill was introduced in the Massachusetts Legislature in 1916. This bill failed to make any headway, although a committee was appointed to investigate social insurance at the time.

On July 1st, this year, Wisconsin inaugurated an unemployment insurance plan after the bill had been regularly defeated for the past decade at

every regular biennial session. Not the so-called socialists from Milwaukee, but Wisconsin farmers made the bill a law. Farmers in that State are in the majority.

The reformist parties of America have resorted to unemployment insurance as a vote-catcher for the past several years. But the avowedly capitalist political parties, as is always the case,

incorporate into capitalist law the measures with which these so-called revolutionary parties plan to usher in a new social order.

The 1934 New York State Platform of the Socialist Party of America includes unemployment insurance, a public works programme, unemployment relief, shortening of the work week, prohibition of child labour, and old-age pensions.

In like manner, the President shapes a "lasting new deal": Federal unemployment insurance, national old-age pensions, nation-wide insurance of workers against sickness, a Federal housing programme, public relief system, amendment of N.R.A. provisions to bring minimum wages into line with costs of living.

This programme is unique in the precedents it sets. Its various points have been the subject of political speeches for decades, but never before was there an emergent condition so severe as to force serious consideration of the proposals. Now, however, President Roosevelt obviously believes the time is ripe for such consideration and he is thought to have decided to make the principal points of his programme public, to have them tested in the elections next Fall.

("New York Times," May 21st, 1934.)

The donkey's bray is the elephant's roar: Republicans were compelled to resort to a vote-catching manoeuvre identical with Roosevelt's promises to the working class:

National Republican Committee at Chicago Aligns the Party Against the Roosevelt Programme: The Platform was a re-affirmation of the economic theories long held by the Republicans and include a promise to support social reforms, including unemployment insurance, greater social legislation, including old-age pensions.

("New York Times," June 7th, 1934.)

In answer to the Republicans, President Roosevelt, two days later, outlined his programme for the expansion of the New Deal as a three-fold

ON OTHER PAGES

	Page
Marx and the Political Machinery ...	67
That's Socialism—That Was! ...	71
Reflections for the New Year ...	72
The Sedition Act ...	72
Lecture Outlines ...	74
Answers to Correspondents ...	77
How Christians Awoke to the Slaughter ...	78
Meetings, Lectures and Discussions—	66, 70, 76, 79, 80

attack on the problem of human security. Roosevelt's three great objectives are—the security of the home, through the enactment of the pending housing bill; the security of livelihood, through the embarkation upon a vast, long-time programme of land reclamation in the Middle West; the security of social insurance, to be brought about by the enactment of unemployment insurance and old-age pensions. In the text of his speech, the President smooths over any agitation he might have caused the capitalists: "We have not opposed the incentive of reasonable and legitimate private profit." The *New York Sun*, on June 8th, had this to say in reference to Roosevelt's fling at the Republicans:

The message—unique among documents of its kind—came as a distinct surprise even to party officials in Washington, and there was no doubt in the minds of observers here that it was provoked by, and intended as, an answer to the attack which the Republican National Committee launched upon the New Deal at Chicago. . . .

After repeated failures, the so-called revolutionary parties continued their attempts with reforms identical with those of the capitalist class parties, to humbug the working class into a revolution. They are incapable of learning from experience and are, again and again, hopelessly out-manœuvred by our skilful rulers, who have the political power to enact reforms when such measures, by attracting voters, help them maintain power.

Roosevelt's public statements concerning unemployment insurance were the cue for Administrator Hopkins to commit himself. With 16,000,000 on the relief rolls to-day, Mr. Hopkins has the conviction that the situation must be handled on some other basis than direct relief because he doesn't think that is "the American way of doing things." Since Mr. Hopkins and his compatriots insist upon the American way, why were Rexford G. Tugwell, of the brain trust, and Colonel G. Elbert, member of the Unemployment Insurance Commission sent to England to study the English capitalists' way of doing things? English capitalists have had more experience in tinkering with their system than have American capitalists. The British unemployment insurance plan "seems to work very well," and a similar plan will do for the unemployed in the United States.

Unemployment insurance as a means of solving one of the greatest problems of capitalism is glimpsed from an early period; in Belgium for a quarter of a century; in Germany and Austria for about a decade; in Denmark and Sweden, New Zealand and Australia. Unemployment insurance was vaguely suggested in 1886 in England, in the Circular of Joseph Chamberlain, then President of the Local Government Board, which urged that unemployment be dealt with outside the Poor Law. There was in that country the passage of the Unemployed Workmen Act of 1905, the National

Insurance Act of 1911, and the Unemployment Insurance Act of 1927.

Furthermore, we are not misled by the reverberation of political string-pulling from the pulpit. Last summer, delegates from 302 churches of the Potomac Synod of the Reformed Church of the United States denounced capitalism, "and agreed that their church should work towards its destruction." This is how they went about it:—

Going further in the direction of Socialism than any other large church organisation in the nation, according to the statement of the Rev. Howard F. Byer, of York, Pa., the synod agreed to use the full strength of its 75,000 members in a national religious movement for shorter hours of labour and higher wages, unemployment insurance and old-age pensions. ("New York Times," June 14th, 1934.)

Along with many other church groups, the Episcopalians asked for the end of child labour and demanded unemployment insurance at their June Diocesan Convention in New York City.

Mass unemployment and semi-starvation force the churches, the large political parties and enumerable conservative groups to take up the cry for reforms. One by one the "socialistic" measures of the past, which shocked both the Liberal and the Conservatives are used by them to-day for the preservation of capitalism. An editorial in the *New York Post*, September 18th, 1934, mentions a book entitled *It's Up To Us*, written by James P. Warburg:—

He points out that eleven of the planks on which Eugene V. Debs ran for president as a Socialist in 1912 are accepted by Conservatives to-day, although they were then considered radical.

In the main, unemployment insurance will only palliate the sufferings of one-seventh of the population now on public funds in this country. It is expected to soak up the discontent of the unemployed, reconciling them to permanent idleness.

Because capitalism—based upon the ownership of the means of living by a class in society—makes necessary the activity of the reformists, Socialists do not waste their time helping to prolong such a state of affairs, but put their time and attention to the replacement of capitalism by the institution of Socialism.

W. M.,

Workers' Socialist Party, U.S.A.

DANCE and SOCIAL

on
Saturday, February 9th, at 7.30 p.m.

at the

Express Dairy, Charing Cross Road
(opposite the Alhambra).

Tickets 1/3 each

from Social Committee or Branch Secretary

* * * * *

NOTE.—The Dance announced for 12th January will not take place.

Marx and the Political Machinery

To the Editorial Committee, the

SOCIALIST STANDARD:

1.—I have to thank you for your elaborate attempt to answer my question. I am not, I confess, very grateful, since it is clear from the character of your reply that a lot of space might have been saved had you said frankly that *the statement in the pamphlet, "S.P.G.B. and Questions of the Day," cannot as it stands be justified.*

Marx simply did not "constantly stress" the "need to gain control of the political machinery." On the contrary Marx says expressly: "The working class cannot simply lay hold of the ready-made State machinery and wield it for its own purposes." (Civil War in France, Martin Lawrence edition, page 37.) This sentence is quoted and endorsed by Marx and Engels in their preface to the 1872 edition of the Communist Manifesto, and is in fact in line with the whole of Marx's own theory and practice.

2.—Where the pamphlet above-cited errs—and you in attempting to defend it—is that, *your own Declaration of Principles notwithstanding*, it fails to distinguish between the *conquest of power* and the mere getting possession of the Governmental (or "political") machinery.

The point at issue will be seen most clearly if and when you realise that the Labour Party, the I.L.P. and all the bourgeois reformist parties aim at "gaining control of the political machinery," which they conceive can be wielded ready-made for their purposes. And since the "machine" has been constructed by the bourgeoisie to serve bourgeois ends, the machine can be, there is no doubt, used ready-made for ends of a bourgeois character.

3.—To gain, or better still, to conquer, *power* means to achieve such a position that the whole political machinery of the bourgeois State can be transformed out of all recognition and replaced by a new revolutionary machine.

This latter revolutionary sense is that indicated—not perhaps as clearly as it might be—in your Declaration of Principles. It is the opposite of the reformist "gain control of the political machinery" which is the doctrine of the pamphlet in question.

4.—You yourselves seem to realise the weakness of the argument of the pamphlet, since you silently substitute in your explanatory comment the formula, "conquest of the powers of government," for the mechanical-reformist formula of the pamphlet. You assert, it is true, that "... the Bolsheviks were helpless until they came into control of the political machinery of the Russian State." (S.S., November, 1934.) If sending

armed detachments to arrest the members of the Provisional Government and to seize possession of their offices, papers, etc., followed by a proclamation that the old "Government" had been sacked and its functions taken over by the E.C. of the All-Russian Congress of Soviets—if *this* is "gaining control of the political machinery" there is no disagreement between us. The process was in this case so clearly one of the actual *conquest* of Governmental power that we can afford to smile at the puerility of the pamphlet, which, in order to make a case for its "mechanistic" theory, is reduced to arguing that the Soviets (which were in fact the chief instrument of revolutionary agitation and action) were the *de facto* "State machinery" of Russia!

5.—If now you turn to the quotations you have selected (I note in passing that although it was quotations from Marx which were called for you have to fall back upon Engels and back him in turn with Lenin (!) and Tom Mann (!!) you will observe several pertinent things.

6.—The quotation from the Communist Manifesto has as its essential content the phrase, "raise the proletariat to the position of ruling class." It must be read in the light of the passage which its authors refer to: "We have seen above." What have the readers of the Communist Manifesto "seen above"? This:—

In depicting the most general phases of the development of the proletariat we traced the more or less veiled civil war, raging within existing society, up to the point where that war breaks out into open revolution, and where the violent overthrow of the bourgeoisie lays the foundation for the sway of the proletariat. (Communist Manifesto, M. L. edition, translation approved by Engels, page 20.)

This is what Marx and Engels meant by "winning the battle of democracy"—democracy here clearly means, as it did to everybody in 1847, not a particular way of voting, but the rule of the common people.

7.—If now you read the other quotations you give, in the light of these passages you will see how completely they negate the "machinery" theory of your pamphlet. Engels, in 1850 ("On the Ten Hours Question"), says the workers must obtain lasting benefit for themselves "by conquering first of all political power." True, he speaks of universal suffrage and a "majority of working men in the House of Commons," but not as *ends in themselves*, only as "guarantees" that they, the workers, will be able to "better their social position."

8.—Marx, in 1852, says, "universal suffrage is the equivalent for political power for the working class . . . its inevitable result here is the political supremacy of the working class." Here again the emphasis ("stress") is upon not the machinery but the power ("supremacy"). Universal suffrage is valued by Marx not for what

it is in itself, but for what he conceived it would have led to in Britain in 1852.

9.—This citation is particularly unfortunate for you in that it, by your standards, shows Marx as an advocate of reforms! Marx in fact, by non-sectarian standards, here appears as an advocate of class-struggle in the form then most immediately and generally available.

10.—A quotation you did not give (why?) falls chronologically into this place: "The emancipation of the working classes must be conquered by the working classes themselves." (Marx, 1864, Provisional rules of the I.W.M.A., page 12, original edition; quoted in full in Stekloff, First International, page 446.) This sentence, by the way, was written thus by Marx in English. It is commonly misquoted through being re-translated from French and German translations.

11.—Marx, in 1871, approves the declaration of the C.C. of the Parisian National Guard: "They have understood that it is their imperious duty and their absolute right to render themselves masters of their own destinies by seizing upon the governmental power." Quite so! But why did you stop your quotation there? The very next sentence (again written by Marx in English) is the one given above: "But the working classes cannot simply . . . purposes."

12.—Engels, in 1883, says: "The working class must first of all take possession of the organised political power of the State and with its aid stamp out the opposition of the capitalist class and organise society anew." Here again there is no talk or suggestion of political "machinery." The question at issue is political power, as is seen most clearly when the rest of the passage you cite is read. It is an argument against the Anarchist theory of abolishing all political power, not in the least a reformist argument for making the gaining possession of the now-established political machinery a *sine qua non* of all Socialist advance.

13.—To sum up: you do not in the least prove that "Marx constantly stressed" "the need to gain control of the political machinery." On the contrary you prove the opposite, viz., that the issue is one not of the "machinery" or of established forms of government, but of the reality of power.

14.—Your quotations from Lenin and Tom Mann have nothing to do with the issue. Neither of them in fact helps your case. Tom Mann is the only one to use the word machinery, and he uses it in a different sense.

Yours, etc., JOHN HAWKINS.

REPLY.

For convenience of reply we have numbered the paragraphs of our correspondent's letter.

Before dealing with the separate paragraphs some explanatory remarks will be useful, and

readers are also advised to look up the letter and reply in the November issue.

The S.P.G.B. holds that when a politically-organised Socialist majority has been built up it will be necessary to gain control of the political machinery, including the armed forces, as an indispensable means towards establishing Socialism. Marx and Engels held the same view. The question at issue between Mr. Hawkins and ourselves is whether or not Marx constantly stressed the need to gain control of the political machinery. We may add that the S.P.G.B. also shares with Marx and Engels the view that the political machinery may require to be modified by the workers, which naturally can be done only after the workers have gained control of it.

Engels' statement written in 1883 sums up our attitude. We reproduce this statement again, because, for a reason given below, it has a particular importance in this discussion, and also because an English translation in accessible form is now published, and we make use of this new translation:—

With the disappearance of an exclusively wealth-possessing minority there also disappears the necessity for the power of armed oppression, or state power. At the same time, however, it was always our view that in order to attain this and the other far more important aims of the future social revolution, the working class must first take possession of the organised political power of the state and by its aid crush the resistance of the capitalist class and organise society anew. *This is to be found already in the Communist Manifesto of 1847, chapter II, conclusion.*

The anarchists put things upside down. They declare that the proletarian revolution must begin by doing away with the political organisation of the state. But after its victory the sole organisation which the proletariat finds already in existence is precisely the state. This state may require very considerable alterations before it can fulfil its new functions. But to destroy it at such a moment would be to destroy the only organism by means of which the victorious proletariat can assert its newly-conquered power, hold down its capitalist adversaries and carry out that economic revolution of society without which the whole victory must end in a new defeat and in a mass slaughter of the workers similar to those after the Paris Commune.

Does it require my express assurance that Marx opposed this anarchist nonsense from the first day it was put forward in its present form by Bakunin?

(Engels' letter to Van Patten, April 18th, 1883. Italics ours, except the word "begin" in paragraph 2. This new translation is taken from "The Correspondence of Marx and Engels," Martin Lawrence, Ltd., page 416.)

The above letter is of particular importance because it shows (paragraph 1) that the view advanced by Engels in 1883 was the same as that held by Marx and himself when, jointly, they wrote the Communist Manifesto in 1847. The wording of the Manifesto of 1847, while fully in agreement with the statement of 1883, is not so precise, but we have here Engels' assurance that he and Marx held then the same view as later on. That, in our view, clinches the matter. If any-

body is to interpret the words written by Marx and Engels in 1847, nobody can be better qualified than Engels himself.

Now for the paragraphs of our correspondent's letter.

1.—The kernel of this paragraph is the ancient misreading of the passage, "the working class cannot simply lay hold of the ready-made State machinery," etc. Of course, they cannot. That is precisely what Engels says in his letter quoted above. The workers cannot "simply" lay hold of it and use it unchanged, they must lay hold of it and give it "very considerable alterations before it can fulfil its new functions."

If Mr. Hawkins will again look up the "Civil War in France," from which he quotes, he will find that Marx made it perfectly clear that the workers should in his view "lay hold of" the ready-made State machinery, modify it, and then use it.

2.—Here Mr. Hawkins tells us that our pamphlet ("The S.P.G.B. and Questions of the Day") fails to distinguish between the "conquest of power" and the mere getting possession of the governmental (or political) machinery.

We can only suppose from this that, apart from the one passage he quotes, Mr. Hawkins did not read the pamphlet, for in several places we emphasise the point that mere possession of the political machinery without the backing of an organised majority of Socialists is useless for the purpose of achieving Socialism. On page 54, for example, begins a section of four pages dealing solely with the inability of the Bolsheviks to introduce Socialism notwithstanding their possession of the governmental machinery.

When our correspondent goes on to refer to the Labour Party and I.L.P. to illustrate his point his facts are wrong and his implication is mystifying. It is not a fact that the Labour Party and I.L.P. conceive that the ready-made political machinery can be wielded unchanged for their purpose. Both of these parties have spent considerable time working out elaborate schemes for modifying the political machinery.

What is more important in this connection is the fact that the Labour Party and I.L.P. should be introduced into the discussion at all. Marx aimed, and the S.P.G.B. aims, at Socialism, recognising the conquest of the political machinery as an indispensable means. Mr. Hawkins seeks to throw light on the question whether or not control of the political machinery is necessary for the purpose of achieving Socialism by asking us to consider the case of the Labour Party and I.L.P. This would only be germane if the Labour Party and I.L.P. have the achievement of Socialism as their aim. This we flatly deny, and we must therefore ask Mr. Hawkins to substantiate it if he thinks they have and wants us to accept it as the basis of discussion.

3.—Here Mr. Hawkins discloses his own view, which is that the "whole political machinery of the bourgeois State" is to be "transformed out of all recognition and replaced by a new revolutionary machine."

We may first point out that this is very different from Engels' view that the existing political machine "may require very considerable alterations," which view, as he says, he and Marx held in 1847.

Secondly Mr. Hawkins might tell us how the workers are to transform the political machinery out of all recognition unless they first gain control of it.

4.—Mr. Hawkins argues in this paragraph that conquest of the powers of Government is not the same as gaining control of the political machinery. This is dealt with in par. 2. However, as we are referred to the Bolshevik conquest of power in Russia, we may reply by quoting from an individual who played a very prominent part in that event.

First of all, as is explained in our pamphlet, the individual in question, L. Trotsky, is himself our authority for the argument that the Bolshevik conquest of power was

"constitutional" because it grew from the "normal" relation of the existing division of power, and that it was achieved by utilising and defending "the constitutional position of the Soviets."

Our correspondent disagrees with Trotsky and ourselves, but gives no support to his case, except to call our case puerile. We shall continue to prefer Trotsky's version in view of the part he played, and the time at which he wrote. We consider him the best authority on the point.

Now let us examine what Trotsky (at that time the hero of the Communists) thought about this question of the political machinery. Speaking in April, 1918, six months after the Bolsheviks conquered power, he said:—

We say in order to organise production in a new manner it is necessary to wrest the state apparatus, the Government machine, from the hands of the enemy and grasp it in our own arms. Otherwise nothing will come of it. Where does exploitation and oppression come from? It comes from private property in the means of production. And who stands up for it, who supports it? The state, so long as it is in the hands of the bourgeoisie. Who can abolish private property? The state as soon as it falls into the hands of the working class. ("A Paradise in this World," page 21, published by British Socialist Party about 1918 or 1919.)

Will Mr. Hawkins now tell us that Trotsky, too, did not mean that the workers must gain control of the political machinery?

5.—Mr. Hawkins objects to quotations from Engels, Lenin and Tom Mann. May we point out, in the first place, that Engels has an obvious claim (not disputed hitherto) as life-long co-worker of Marx to know what Marx's views were?

With regard to Lenin and Mann, these were given, as was clearly explained, because they were of interest as examples of the interpretation placed

upon Marx by men professing to be Marxists, an interpretation similar to Engels and our own.

6.—As explained above in the introductory paragraph of our reply, Engels has himself set beyond reasonable doubt what he and Marx meant when they wrote the Communist Manifesto in 1847.

7.—Our correspondent in this paragraph introduces the conception of universal suffrage, and a majority of working men in the House of Commons "as ends in themselves," and apparently expects us to try to defend this conception. As we do not hold it and have never done so, and as there is nothing in our pamphlet saying that we do, we fail to understand why Mr. Hawkins drags it in.

8.—Our correspondent in this paragraph agrees with us and with Marx that "universal suffrage is the equivalent for political power for the working class," and that its "inevitable result here is the political supremacy of the working class."

That being so, we really do not see what there can be left to argue about. To say that Marx stressed "supremacy," not "machinery," is either baseless, in that the passage, in fact, contains no italicised portions at all, or else is a mere quibble. Our original statement, that Marx constantly stressed the need to gain control of the political machinery, does not require for its validity that Marx should constantly have stressed particular words or phrases, but that he should have returned again and again to the question, invariably putting the same view. We have produced several such passages from Marx and Engels, extending over their whole active political life, from 1847 onwards.

Our correspondent, let it be noted, has not produced one solitary statement from Marx or Engels putting the contrary view, that the workers do not need to gain control of the political machinery.

9.—We are told in this paragraph that it is particularly unfortunate for us that Marx held certain views on reforms. As Mr. Hawkins does not explain what bearing Marx's views on reforms have on the view that it is necessary to gain control of the political machinery, we cannot follow the matter up.

10.—We wholeheartedly agree with Marx that the "emancipation of the working classes must be conquered by the working classes themselves" (with the one qualification that we prefer the word "class" to "classes"), but we do not understand what bearing this has on the claim that the emancipation of the working class by the working class needs, as a means, the control of the political machinery.

11.—This is dealt with in (1) above.

12.—Here we are told that Engels, in his letter, written in 1883 (see introductory paragraph of our reply, above) was not talking of political machinery, but of political power. This can easily be tested. All we need to do is to place the words "political power" in a relevant passage.

The original passage reads:—

This state may require very considerable alteration before it can fulfil its new functions.

Mr. Hawkins' suggested alteration would make it read:—

Political power may require very considerable alterations, etc.

The view that Engels was talking about power in some abstract, unexplained way, and not about the machinery of the existing State, simply will not hold water.

13.—Here, again, Mr. Hawkins says that Marx was not thinking of political machinery, but of "the reality of power." It will be noticed, however, that our correspondent cannot give, here or anywhere else in his letter, a statement from Marx to the effect that in his view it is not necessary for the workers to gain control of the political machinery. Nor does he explain what reality power could have if divorced from control of the political machinery. Marx's statement in 1852, that "universal suffrage is the equivalent for political power for the working class of England," is alone sufficient to indicate what Marx's view was.

We have seen that Engels always, and Trotsky and Lenin, at least on some occasions, took the same view of Marx's attitude towards gaining control of the political machinery as we do. We are content to leave it at that.

14.—We note that Mr. Hawkins believes that when Tom Mann said that the organised State machine must be wrested from the capitalists by the workers he was not using machine in the sense used by us. We also note that Mr. Hawkins does not explain in what sense Mr. Mann was using it.

ED. COMM.

EDUCATIONAL COURSE FOR PARTY MEMBERS.

Classes will be held at HEAD OFFICE on Sundays from 4 p.m. to 6 p.m., as follows:—

January 6th	- - - - -	"General Strikes."
" 13th	- - - - -	"The Internationals."
" 20th	- - - - -	"Ancient Religion."
" 30th	- - - - -	"Modern Religion."
February 3rd	- - - - -	"Science."

INFORMAL DISCUSSIONS

Held at Head Office

Informal political discussions are being arranged for each Saturday from 7 p.m. to 9 p.m., at Head Office, commencing on December 8th. Tea will be available.

Readings from Socialist Classics

Commencing Tuesday, December 4th, readings from Socialist classics will take place each Tuesday evening, at Head Office, from 7 p.m. to 8 p.m.

THAT'S SOCIALISM—THAT WAS!

The I.L.P. is not a Socialist organisation and has never had a clear understanding of Socialism; consequently by its propaganda it has confused the minds of the workers.

During the War—believing that nationalisation was Socialism—the I.L.P. tried to make us believe that England was being run on Socialist lines. Speaking at Leicester, in August, 1914, Mr. Ramsay MacDonald, at that time an idol of the I.L.P., urged all Labour organisations to help the Government in its time of crisis and then said that "it was significant that the principles of Socialism had come to the country's aid." ("Labour Leader," August 13th, 1914.) In the same issue there is an article by J. J. M., with the title, "Socialism to the Rescue!" and the sub-heading, "Our Principles Applied to Prevent Disaster!"

Perhaps, here, some I.L.P.-ers will object, saying: "Oh! but that's the past! We have changed. We know now that Socialism wasn't made use of during the War."

But have they changed? Let us see by examining more recent copies of their organ. In the "New Leader" (January 29th, 1932) Minnie Pallister writes to explain Socialism. She says: "No Socialist ever dreams of doing away with capital. . . . Until the nation owns its own land, mines, factories, controls its own currency, it depends for the supplies of necessary goods upon chance. . . ." Now since capital is that part of wealth used for producing profits, capital cannot possibly exist in Socialist society when goods will be produced solely for use. Furthermore, goods being produced for use under Socialism, there will be no need for any currency. Money is necessary to-day because goods are produced to be exchanged. If we are told that here again we are dealing with the past, we reply that no member of the I.L.P. protested, despite the fact that Minnie Pallister said so emphatically that "No Socialist ever dreams of doing away with capital." What were the leaders of the I.L.P. doing—the Maxtons and the Brockways? Obviously they agreed with her "explanation" of Socialism!

But let us turn to a still more recent issue of the "New Leader" (September 28th, 1934). Therein there is an article entitled "What Keir Hardie Was Like." Now if the I.L.P. has of late found out what Socialism really is, why do they speak of him as "the pioneer of Socialism in Great Britain"? Keir Hardie thought that nationalisation was Socialism, and thought that in 1914 the interests of the British workers and their exploiters were identical. He went, therefore, on

recruiting platforms, and boasted of the number of recruits he had made. Surely, here the I.L.P. had a fine chance to prove to the workers that they had really broken with their past.

In the same issue we are entertained by Ethel Mannin. She writes an article on "Russia—the Country with a Future." After telling us that "food rations are sparse . . .," that "the mass of people [are] poorly dressed" and that "the general impression of the crowds in the streets is one of drabness and poverty," she tells us that the Metro workers "asked that their rates of pay, which are very high, be reduced to the level of workmen engaged on other constructional work." Then we are given this piece of information: ". . . in Russia the workers are not working to pile up profits for employers; they are working for themselves; their country belongs to them; theirs are the interests vested in the country; they are the shareholders of the prosperity, they are building up." (Italics hers.) Now if the Russian workers (and no one else!) are the "shareholders," why does the Russian State borrow capital from investors at home and abroad and put itself to the trouble of paying them 10 per cent. interest on their loans? If Russia is Socialist, why do some workers receive 10, 20 and more times as much wages as others; nay, why do they receive wages at all? Despite the fact that all the principal characteristics of capitalism are evident in Russia, the I.L.P. told us a few weeks ago to be on the watch, or else war might be declared on Socialist Russia ("New Leader," August 31st, 1934). The I.L.P., which claims to have rejected its former nationalisation schemes, now hails as Socialism, nationalisation (or State Capitalism) in Russia.

What conclusion can we draw then that the I.L.P. is as far as ever from a real understanding of Socialism. It is obvious that it is confusing the minds of the workers, and that no Socialist should be in its ranks. C. A.

Bound Volumes of "The Socialist Standard"

For Years up to August, 1918.

1 Year Vol.	6/6	2 Year Vol.	8/3 post free
3 " " " " " "	9/3	4 " " " " " "	10/9 " "

For Years from September, 1918 to August, 1932.

1 Year Vol.	5/6	2 Year Vol.	7/3 post free
3 " " " " " "	8/9	4 " " " " " "	10/3 " "

For Years from September, 1932, onwards.

Prices as for years up to August, 1918.

(The size of the page was altered in September, 1918, and again in September, 1932. Series extending over these dates must therefore be bound in separate volumes.)

INDEX to "SOCIALIST STANDARD"

A full Index for the year ended August, 1934, is on sale, price 2d. (post free 2½d.). Order from Literature Secretary, 42, Great Dover Street, S.E.1, or nearest branch.

Copies of the Index for the previous year are also on sale.

THE SOCIALIST STANDARD

JANUARY,



1935

OFFICIAL NOTICE

All communications for the Executive Committee. Subscriptions for the *SOCIALIST STANDARD*, Articles, and Correspondence submitted for insertion therein, should be addressed—The Socialist Party of Great Britain, 42, Great Dover Street, London, S.E.1, to whom Money Orders should be made payable.

The meetings of the Executive Committee are held at the Head Office, every Tuesday, at 7.30 p.m.

TERMS OF SUBSCRIPTIONS.

Twelve Months, post free	2s. 6d.
Six Months, post free	1s. 8d.

Reflections for the New Year

A new year has come round again, and brings to mind the annual question, "How long, oh, Lord, how long," must we work, and hunger, and squirm under oppressive social conditions? Outside the ranks of our Party there are thousands and thousands of workers who feel the pressure of servile conditions and bitterly complain, yet they are deaf to our message. To such our view is the "long view," but they want "something now." For over a century workers have been struggling for "something now," and how has it left them? Bound tightly to the wheel of capital, faced with the poverty and insecurity, that is their common lot to-day.

As we have so often pointed out the problem is a simple one. The insecurity and bondage that is the lot of the working class arises from the private ownership of the means of living. The conversion of these means of living into the common property of society will enable the product of industry to flow wherever needed, instead of only to those who have the money to buy. As the working class performs the work of producing and distributing the wealth to-day nothing can be lost by the change-over, except the privileges of an idle and parasitic class.

The simplicity of the Socialist position is a guarantee that if it is sufficiently pressed to the attention of workers it must ultimately convince them, and gain their support. But it is the pressing that is the trouble. The small amount of leisure available to those who are advocating Socialism makes the spreading of our views a long job until our membership has reached dimensions which will

enable our view to be put everywhere and at all times.

Yet, slow though our growth is, we are growing, and every year shows increase in activity, new forms of activity, and the wider spread of our views. In particular, there has been, in recent years, a gratifying increase in the number of, and attendance at, indoor meetings. We are gradually building up a large staff of competent speakers which will have fruitful results in the near future.

There is always the central fact that is both a spur to our efforts and a solace, and it is that the abolition of private ownership of the means of production and the establishment of Socialism is the only solution to the economic evils of to-day, and further, that this can be accomplished when the workers understand it and want it.

Those who wish to make New Year resolutions of an unusual kind—resolutions to be kept—have an excellent opportunity. Let them make up their mind to study Socialism, and work for its achievement in the way that is open to them: By joining us and helping with voice, pen, funds, and other ways to speed the birth of a new and much-needed social order.

That is our New Year message to all workers.

The Sedition Act

The Incitement to Disaffection Act has been the subject of attacks from many quarters, particularly from organisations with working-class labels, where it has aroused something like hysteria.

The Act will give the Government wide powers in dealing with those "who are attempting to seduce members of the armed forces from their allegiance to the Crown." Pacifists, Churchmen, Liberals, Labourites, I.L.P.ers, Communists, and even some Conservatives, have been boon companions for the purpose of denouncing this Bill as an attack on "Liberty, Democracy, Political Freedom," etc.

The Act, however, is not of fundamental importance. The capitalists, undisturbed in their control of the State machine, have, in fact, always been able to restrict working-class activities when they found it necessary, and will continue to do so until the workers cease voting their masters into power.

It is, therefore, nothing short of impertinence for Liberals, Churchmen and others who have aided Governments in the past to suppress the workers at times of strikes, lock-outs, etc., to pose as protectors of "Our Rights."

Similarly with the Labour Party's protests in the House of Commons.

Mr. Lansbury, for instance, who asked for an assurance that troops would not be used against the

workers during industrial disputes (he called it "An open case of favouring the employers!"), must have a conveniently short memory. Else why should he expect a Conservative Government to do what the Labour Government of 1924 bluntly refused to do, when they turned down an amendment by Mr. Lansbury, which would have given Army recruits the option of refusing to take duty in connection with a trade dispute. (Parliamentary Reports, April 2nd, 1934.)

Was not that same Labour Government prepared to use the Emergency Powers Act against the Transport Workers, who were then on strike? (*Daily Herald*, April 1st, 1924.)

Their objections seem as little sincere as those of the religious fraternity, who denounced the Sedition Bill as being antagonistic to the teachings of Christianity. This Church and its mouthpieces are truly fit apostles of Freedom! (Incidentally, it may be noted that Sir T. Inskip, the Attorney-General, who was in charge of the Bill for the Government, is a devout Churchman.) Among the opponents of the Bill were organisations like the Communist Party and the I.L.P., which toy with the suicidal idea of armed insurrection. It does not appear to have occurred to them that their activities have provided the Government with a good excuse for pushing this Bill through.

It does not, however, materially alter the conditions of the task of converting the workers to Socialism. When a majority of the workers are Socialists and are politically organised, they will gain control of the State-

machine, which carries with it control of the armed forces.

There is no need, therefore, to engage in the costly and almost fruitless task of converting soldiers to Socialism first.

In any event it is odd that reformist professional politicians, who do not preach *Socialism* to the civil population should think it worth their while to peddle their Reformist stock-in-trade amongst the armed forces. Moreover, while the leaders may be aware of the risks they are running, this is not always true of their working-class victims in the Army, Navy, or Air Force, on whom the law is much more severe.

The S.P.G.B. condemns such activities as dangerous and futile from the working-class standpoint.

Dangerous, because it gives reactionaries an excuse and a weapon for political suppression, futile because Socialism cannot be established through a civil war fought by non-Socialists about reformist issues.

To achieve Socialism it is necessary to have a majority of the working class who *understand* and *want* a Socialist system of production and distribution, the common ownership of the means of life. Given such a majority organised in the Socialist Party, any questions of the views and actions of the armed forces will fall into their proper

perspective. The Socialist Movement has too many real problems to waste time on imaginary ones.

S. R.

THE SOCIALIST PARTY OF GREAT BRITAIN

OBJECT.—The establishment of a system of society based upon the common ownership and democratic control of the means and instruments for producing and distributing wealth by and in the interest of the whole community.

DECLARATION OF PRINCIPLES

THE SOCIALIST PARTY of Great Britain HOLDS—

That society as at present constituted is based upon the ownership of the means of living (i.e., land, factories, railways, etc.) by the capitalist or master class, and the consequent enslavement of the working class, by whose labour alone wealth is produced.

That in society, therefore, there is an antagonism of interests, manifesting itself as a class struggle, between those who possess but do not produce, and those who produce but do not possess.

That this antagonism can be abolished only by the emancipation of the working class from the domination of the master class, by the conversion into the common property of society of the means of production and distribution, and their democratic control by the whole people.

That as in the order of social evolution the working class is the last class to achieve its freedom, the emancipation of the working class will involve the emancipation of all mankind without distinction of race or sex.

That this emancipation must be the work of the working class itself.

That as the machinery of government, including the armed forces of the nation, exists only to conserve the monopoly by the capitalist class of the wealth taken from the workers, the working class must organise consciously and politically for the conquest of the powers of government, national and local, in order that this machinery, including these forces, may be converted from an instrument of oppression into the agent of emancipation and the overthrow of privilege, aristocratic and plutocratic.

That as all political parties are but the expression of class interests, and as the interest of the working class is diametrically opposed to the interests of all sections of the master class, the party seeking working-class emancipation must be hostile to every other party.

THE SOCIALIST PARTY of Great Britain, therefore, enters the field of political action determined to wage war against all other political parties, whether alleged labour or avowedly capitalist, and calls upon the members of the working class of this country to muster under its banner to the end that a speedy termination may be wrought to the system which deprives them of the fruits of their labour, and that poverty may give place to comfort, privilege to equality, and slavery to freedom.

Those agreeing with the above principles and desiring enrolment in the Party should apply for membership form to secretary of nearest branch or at Head Office.

Lecture Outlines.

Educational lectures by different members have been delivered at Party Headquarters every Sunday afternoon during the winter. As these lectures may have a wider interest we are printing the Syllabuses, the first four of which appear below.

These lectures have been a very useful enlargement of Party activity, and are an excellent example of the value of co-operative effort.

All arrangements for the class, including the selection of lectures, and visits to Museums, involving a considerable amount of labour, have been the work of the Class Organiser, Comrade Cameron. Each lecture has taken nearly two hours to deliver, and in nearly all cases the Syllabus has been drawn up by the member who delivered the lecture.

Although this year the classes have been held at Head Office only, the Organiser proposes next year to extend them to several London and Provincial centres.

METHODS OF STUDY.

(Synopsis of Lecture by E. HARDY on September 23rd.)

- To some extent methods of study must vary with the subject and the individual. These variations can be learned by experience only. There is, however, a considerable body of principles which can be profitably applied to most subjects and by most individuals.
- Scientific Methods.* First among these are logical methods of reasoning, and the application of "scientific methods." In the course of ordinary daily life all people acquire some knowledge of logic and the "scientific methods." It is very desirable, however, that students should make a brief special study of these methods.
- The intelligently critical attitude of mind. Constructive criticism. Challenging and seeking for reasons.
- Purpose.* The S.P.G.B. has a definite limited purpose. Learn to direct your energy and to avoid side issues.
- Note-taking.*
 - At Lectures. (b) When reading books. First summarise in the writer's words. Then in own words. (c) Learn to "skim" books. (d) Different methods for different subjects.
- Attitude towards "Authorities."*
 - Marx and Engels. (b) "Public men" (usually ignorant of specialised knowledge. Cabinet Ministers, for example, are rarely experts in their own Departments). (c) Specialist in one field not dependable in another, even when seemingly closely allied. (d) Beware assumption that "admissions" by opponents are necessarily

support for our case. (e) Bias. (f) Appreciate value of specialist's knowledge after discounting defects.

- Value of specialisation in one subject as an aid to learning methods of study in general.
- Necessity of knowing the "other side."
 - Discussion with fellow students. (b) Discussion with opponents. (c) Read opponent's case.
- Pamphlets as an introduction to fuller study.
- Reference Books.*
- Libraries.*
- Current Reading: newspapers, etc.*
- Cuttings and Classification.*
- Expression.* Speaking and Writing.
 - Outdoor Meetings. (b) Indoor Lectures. (c) Debates. (d) Personal contacts. (e) Writing.
- Warnings.*
 - Avoid Dogmatism. (b) Avoid getting out of depth. (c) Avoid going beyond evidence. (d) Misuse of statistics.
- Conclusion.* Aim at knowledge and accuracy; not defeating opponents. (Past S.P. controversies, e.g., Trade Unions; Increased Productivity; Reforms; Reformist Parties.)

Bibliography.

Essentials of Scientific Method, by A. Wolf (5s. 6d.). A System of Logic (Books 3, 4 and 6), by J. S. Mill. How we Think, by John Dewey (8s. 6d.). Methods of Social Study, by S. and B. Webb (10s. 6d.).

MATERIALISM.

(Synopsis of Lecture by ROBERTUS, September 30th, 1930.)
A. MECHANICAL.

- Foundation in Greek Philosophy.* Thales (640-548 B.C.) Search for First Principle. Heraclitus (576-480 B.C.) Senses as source of all true knowledge. Democritus 5th century B.C.) Sensation true subjectively, not objectively.
- Medieval Scholasticism.*
 - Philosophy subordinate to theology;
 - Philosophy allied to theology;
 - Beginnings of cleavage. Abelard (1079-1142), "Reason should explain Faith." R. Bacon (1214-1294), "Study Physics."
- Renaissance and Reformation.*
 - Francis Bacon (1561-1626), Inductive Method. System of thought. Specific rules of observation and examination.
 - Extensions of same methods.
 - Descartes (1596-1666). Consciousness as starting-point and basis of all knowledge. "I think, therefore I am."

(b) Spinoza (1632-1677). The Universal Reality is *substance*—thing in itself.

(c) Hobbes (1588-1679). "There is nothing in the mind which was not previously in the senses."

(d) Locke (1632-1704). Metaphysics made into experimental physics of the mind.

4. Eighteenth Century.

- Condillac (1715-1780). Our faculties (e.g., Reason), *not innate*.
- Encyclopedists (1740-1770). Reasoned System of All Knowledge. Universal Scepticism. Applications of Materialism. D'Alembert. D'Holbach. *Diderot*.
- Kant (1724-1804). Double origin of ideas: subject plus object.
- Hegel (1770-1831). Identity of opposites. All things flow. Thesis-Antithesis-Synthesis; dialectics. Absolute Idea.

5. Nineteenth Century.

- Comte (1798-1857). Positivism. Philosophy of *history*.
- Triumph of naturalist method. Lamarck (1744-1829). Acquired characteristics. Darwin 1809-1882). Theory of Evolution. Origin of Species, 1859.
- First application of philosophic materialism to all society. Buckle (1821-1882). History of Civilisation.
- Feuerbach (1775-1833). Consciousness determined by existence Influenced Marx and Engels.

6. Twentieth Century.

- Determinism. Wm. James and Pragmatism. Ch. Cohen and Secularism.
- Reaction against materialism. Jeans, Edington, etc.

B. HISTORICAL.

- Formulation of Materialist Conception of History by Marx and Engels. "History of all human society . . . has been the history of class struggles." Religion, morality, etc., explained by prevailing methods of production and exchange, and social relations arising therefrom.
- Application of materialist method to tracing causes of social development. L. H. Morgan's *Ancient Society*, 1877.

C. THE M.C.H. IN PRESENT-DAY APPLICATION.

Its use to S.P.G.B.: the means of complete understanding of past and present social movements, and hence indispensable in the enlightenment of the working class.

Bibliography.

G. H. Lewes, History of Philosophy; L. H. Morgan, *Ancient Society*; K. Kautsky, *Ethics and the M.C.H.*, Thomas More;

J. Dietzgen, *Positive Outcome of Philosophy*; Labriola, *Essays in the M.C.H.*; F. Engels, *Socialism, Utopian and Scientific*; K. Marx, *Eighteenth Brumaire*, *Communist Manifesto* (Riazanov annotated edition).

PRIMITIVE SOCIETY.

(Synopsis of Lecture delivered by C. LESTOR, October 7th, 1934.)

- In civilised societies the bond of union is *property*. In primitive societies the bond of union was *kinship*. The history of ancient society is the history of the origin and growth of property, the State, the family and religion, until a society based on private property arose out of the ruins of the society based on kinship. Man wandered over the earth for thousands of years before settling down into civilized communities.
- Private property is foreign to the savage mind.*
 - Made its first appearance under Barbarism with taming of animals and development of flocks and herds.
 - Led to barter—earliest form of exchange.
 - Altered marriage customs, and finally, was the cause of alteration of law of inheritance from female to male, and break-up of gentes.
- Property first belonged to tribe (e.g., Iroquois). Later became collective property of village community (e.g., India). Agriculture broke up village communities and brought private property. Arable lands the first to become private property.
- Morgan revolutionised conceptions of anthropology.* Saw fundamental difference between ancient and modern family. (The gens.) Traced first outline of prehistoric times.
- Prehistory divided into *Savagery* and *Barbarism*, each sub-divided into Lower, Middle, Upper. Changes came with new adaptations to natural forces; corresponding changes in habitation, religion, etc.
- Savagery.*
 - Began with acquisition of articulated language. Man lived in hordes, wandered through forests; only tools—branches and stones. Tropical climate.
 - Discovery of fire. Wandered further. Stone club and spear, cave life, hunting. Classes begin.
 - Bows and arrows. Polished stone implements. Pictures on walls. Log boats, baskets, bone tools. Began to accumulate property, which belonged to woman's gens. Gentes, phratries and tribes develop.
- Barbarism.*
 - Discovery of pottery making. Highly-polished stone implements. Stockaded

villages. Bread making. Dogs tamed. Confederacy of tribes under council of chiefs. Picture writing.

- (ii) Domesticated animals, slavery, herdsmen. Possibility of leisure for section of people. Priesthood and aristocracy develop. Bronze casting. Fortified villages, lake dwellings, tenement houses of wood, mud, stone. Hieroglyphic writing.

- (iii) Iron and agriculture. Individual ownership of property. Walled and battle-mented towns. First great class struggle over law of inheritance—change from women to men. Advanced form of municipal life in cities. Civilization commenced with discovery of letter script and its use for writing records.

8. Savage and Barbarian peoples are hospitable and unwarlike. Development of property introduced the savage wars for slaves and loot of the early and mediæval civilizations.

Bibliography.

Morgan, Ancient Society; Engels, Origin of the Family; Lafargue, Evolution of Property; Waddell, Makers of Civilization; Elliot-Smith, Human History.

SLAVE CIVILIZATIONS.

(Synopsis of Lecture by GILMAC, October 14th, 1934.)

Slavery a very old institution.

- (1) Its probable origin.
- (2) Its advantages at the dawn of civilization.
- (3) Its evil effects later.

Factors enabling civilization to develop.

- (1) Prolific soil and water supply.
- (2) Presence of natural resources in minerals, etc.
- (3) Easy channels for communication and commerce.
 - (a) Sea, rivers, caravan routes.
 - (b) System of writing for recording and conveying information.
- (4) Animals capable of domestication.

Settlement necessary before civilization was possible.

- (1) Knowledge of agriculture.
- (2) Development of means of storage.
- (3) Progress in the arts of architecture, etc.
- (4) All early civilizations were city states.

Some outstanding ancient civilizations.

- (1) Babylonia, which thrived approximately 3,000-6,000 years ago.
- (2) Egypt, 3,000-6,000 years ago.
- (3) Crete, 3,300-3,900 years ago.
- (4) Greece, 2,000-3,000 years ago.
- (5) Rome, 1,500-2,500 years ago.

Geographical conditions were a factor in moulding them.

- (1) Influence of mountains on Babylon and Greece.
- (2) Influence of rivers on Babylon and Egypt.
- (3) Influence of the sea on Crete, Greece, and Rome.
- (4) Influence of the climate on the people, and their productions.

The social systems.

- (1) Agriculture the basis.
- (2) Private property safeguarded.
- (3) Division into classes.
- (4) Position of the chattel slaves.
- (5) Political organisation.
- (6) Commercial activities (prominence of usury).

Economic objects of wars.

- (1) Plunder and tribute.
- (2) Slaves.
- (3) Securing of sources of supply.
- (4) Clearing of trade routes.
- (5) Destruction of trade competitors.

Wealth and achievements.

- (1) Hanging gardens of Babylon.
- (2) Pyramids of Egypt.
- (3) Palaces of Crete.
- (4) Philosophy and Art of Greece.
- (5) Legal and Governmental institutions of Rome.

Influence of chattel slavery on decay of ancient civilization.

Modernity of some of the ideas and ways of the ancient peoples.

Continuity of social development and the legacies of the past.

Books:

Jastrow, Babylonia and Assyria, 1915; Smith, Early History of Assyria, 1928; Woolley, The Sumerians, 1928; Breasted, History of Egypt; Flinders Petrie, Social Life in Ancient Egypt; Hawes, Crete, the Forerunner of Greece, 1909; Hall, Ægean Archaeology, 1915; Halliday, Growth of the City State; Whibley, Political Parties in Athens; Rostovtzeff, Social and Economic History of Roman Empire; Paterson, Nemesis of Nations.

SHEFFIELD.

A MEETING will be held in ROOM 2, A.E.U. INSTITUTE, STANLEY STREET, ON

Monday, January 28th, at 7.30 p.m.

"What the S.P.G.B. Stands for" - G. H. Southgate

Admission Free. Questions and discussion, Non-Members invited.

Answers to Correspondents

A SOCIALIST MAJORITY AND A CAPITALIST MINORITY

Two correspondents (A. H. J., Portslade, and T. W. S., Luton) raise the question of a capitalist minority clinging to power despite the existence of a Socialist majority. We are asked how we propose to gain control in these circumstances if we are committed to observing whatever conditions the minority choose to impose. In other words, how can a Socialist majority get rid of an anti-Socialist minority if the latter uses its power to suspend elections or take similar measures designed to prevent the majority from gaining control of the political machinery.

It would appear that these and some other correspondents are under a misapprehension as to the case of the S.P.G.B. We do not and never have held the impossible position of committing ourselves to doing only those things that some minority in the future might choose to declare constitutional, and of refraining from whatever such a minority might declare to be unconstitutional. That is not and never has been our case.

In brief, the Socialist case can be summed up as follows:—

- (1) Socialism as a working system of society is impossible without the understanding and support of at least a majority of the population.
- (2) Therefore, conquest of the political machinery by a minority, even if practicable, is useless for the purpose of achieving Socialism.

- (3) The organised Socialist majority will need to gain control of the machinery of government before it can introduce Socialism.

- (4) It will be absolutely impossible for a capitalist minority in control of the political machinery to prevent an organised Socialist majority from obtaining control of the political machinery, although it is conceivable that in certain circumstances the minority might delay that event.

- (5) It is highly improbable, in our view, that defenders of capitalism gradually reduced to a minority in a series of elections, will resort to naked force in face of the will of the organised united majority. Should they do so, however, it is of great importance that their position should be weakened (as it would be) by the clear demonstration that they were usurping power and attempting to destroy representative government and majority rule.

Anyone who supposes that a minority can resist an organised and determined majority would do well to ask himself why Kerensky's government relinquished power into the hands of their bitter enemies, the Bolsheviks, and why Alfonso fled and made way for the Republicans.

We have no doubt whatever that the task of getting rid of any obstruction by a usurping

capitalist minority will be trivial in comparison with our present task of building up that Socialist majority, politically organised, without which Socialism is unthinkable. ED. COMM.

A QUESTION ON POLICY.

A correspondent writes as follows: "Is not your criticism of the alleged reformist policy of the united front of the I.L.P. and the Communist Party contrary to the dialectical principles of Marx? Seeing that capitalism is in decline and that the capitalist class cannot grant any more reforms, does not the demand for these reforms become revolutionary? In other words does not the present position of capitalism reconcile an apparent contradiction in the policies of these parties?"

First let us deal with the facts and then turn our attention to the principles. Our correspondent offers no evidence that the capitalist class cannot grant any more reforms, by which we take it that he means such measures as increased unemployment pay, etc. It is not true that the capitalists cannot "afford" any more such measures. The class as a whole have never been in the habit of giving things away to the workers simply because they could afford it. They have had tangible motives for any concessions they have granted; among them to minimise the risk of riots or the increase of petty crimes against property due to extreme destitution on the part of great masses. The "reform," in this sense, is simply an alternative to a larger and more expensive police force, larger prisons, workhouses and so on, all of which cost money. It is, therefore, not a question of what the capitalists can afford, so much as what it is sound economic policy for them to give. They simply choose the cheapest and most effective way of keeping the workers, including the unemployed, quiet.

One of the most glaring features of every crisis in capitalism such as the present is the curtailment of production owing to the presence or danger of surplus stocks. This applies to food-stuffs as well as other things. It is thus perfectly clear that if the workers starve it is not because the capitalists do not possess the means of feeding them. In America we read of the Government organising the distribution of surplus grain for feeding some of the unemployed. In this country the Government has recently restored the 2s. 9d. to the unemployed that the united front has made such a fuss about for the past three years.

Are we, then, to number Neville Chamberlain and President Roosevelt among the revolutionaries?

What, then, becomes of our correspondent's "dialectical principles"? If demanding reforms, which he says are impossible, is equal to demanding revolution, then, logically and conversely, to demand revolution is to demand the impossible, and then where are we?

The Socialist Party recognises in its principles the contradiction in modern society, namely, the antagonism of interests between the capitalist class and the working class; but we cannot "reconcile the contradiction," as our correspondent expresses it, by appearing on both sides of the fence simultaneously. We can only express the interests of the working class by demanding Socialism. Reform is the business of the master class.

E. B.

How Christians Awoke to the Slaughter

("Arms and the Clergy," 1914-1918. By G. Bedborough. Price, 1s. Pioneer Press, 64, Farringdon Street, E.C.4.)

The writer and publishers of this booklet are to be complimented upon presenting us with a few hundred of the many thousands of utterances made by the soldiers of Christ during the late war. In these days, when everyone is talking "peace" and will continue so doing until the next war, when the few who then talk peace will be persecuted or put into gaol, it is useful to have this record to hand. The followers of the "Prince of Peace" have ever been known to be on the side of the big guns; their allegiance and adhesion to the powers that be is as insistent as it is unctuous. "Divine sanction" for killing, maiming, persecuting and lying. And why not? Does not the Holy Bible give us this "sanction"? Of course, it does. Is not the "reason" for our ripping each other up in wartime always a "holy" one, which becomes "holier" according to the material advantages at stake? Read your Bible; it is a veritable chamber of horrors masquerading under the guise of "moral law." The secular arm of the capitalist state has at least in its favour the fact that it relies upon its own material organisation to win it victory in war.

But its religious limb presents us with the tragicomic scena of having the same "God" operating on all sides at one and the same time. But, as the nigger said, "Dere is no daht abaht it dat God am a good all-round man." If we could but impart the philosophy of that nigger into the general human mind we should be bidding a fair good-bye not only to Christianity, but all religions. For, expressed in psychological terms, "God" being a "good all-round man," in reality means that humanity makes its own gods; there are no others. They therefore think and do what humanity thinks and does, a fact well known to all scientific students of religion. "God" wills what man wills.

However, let us resume company with Mr. Bedborough and his parsons. He reminds us that from the moment of the outbreak of hostilities the clergy of England were anxious that they should

not run the risk of becoming active participants in the trenches or other danger zones. Presumably they might avoid the risks if they became recruiting sergeants. So "Onward Christian soldiers" went to fight, but not parsons. Many of them preferred to sing their hymns of hate in safety and to counsel their sheep to the slaughter. After all, what does the loss of one's life matter in the realms of Christian teaching? What is this life for but a preparation for the holy kingdom hereafter? The "spiritual world" of Christian fancy has ever been of more importance than the world of reality in which we have our being. The following are a few of the "lofty" or "spiritual" sayings cited by Mr. Bedborough, and taken at random.

The Bishop of London at St. Paul's Cathedral, August 9th, 1914:—

May it not be that this cup of hardship which we drink together will turn out to be the very draught which we need. And at the bottom of the cup there will be joy.

The Rev. William Adams Brown, D.D., at Memorial Hall, London, October 16th, 1914:—

God is in history, and because He is, we may be sure that the ultimate outcome will be good. . . . How the Old Testament lives again in the light of contemporary events. What a grim commentary upon Isaiah and Jeremiah are the events which are even now transpiring in Belgium and France—the country desolate, the cities burned with fire, the land devoured by strangers. . . . What does the Christian see as he contemplates the mysteries of God's Providence? . . . In the first place, he sees God at work.

What we see, so far from being a disproof of God's moral government of men, is the most august demonstration the world has ever seen of the inexorableness of the moral laws. . . . Once again God is teaching us . . .

What a God and what a moral law! What a teaching! From the "Christian World Pulpit," October 30th, 1918, Rev. Lucius Bugbee:—

To those who fall I say you will not die but step into immortality. Your mothers will not lament your fate, but will be proud to have borne such sons. Your names will be revered for ever by your grateful country, and God will take you unto Himself.

We like that stepping into immortality. Most of the clergy kept a firm step on Mother Earth, and a firm hand on the pay envelope. The Archbishop of York:—

In my judgment, every Christian man may give his whole-hearted loyalty to King and country in this war, and earnestly believe that in so doing he is not disloyal to the Kingdom of God. We can carry this cause without shame to the presence of Him Who is Judge of the whole earth, and ask Him to bless it.

—"Church Times," August 14th, 1914.)

For sheer bestiality, some of the American Christians would be hard to beat. Take this one, for example:—

Never miss an opportunity to destroy the eyes of the enemy. In all head-holds use the finger on the eyes. They are the most delicate points in the body, and easy to reach. The eye can easily be removed with the finger.

—A. E. Marriott, Y.M.C.A.

physical director at Camp Sevier.

Here is another of like kind:—

(Pointing to the location of his vital organs.) Three inches are not enough, seven inches are too many, and twelve inches are more than too many, for while you are pulling out the bayonet you are losing the opportunity to drive it into another man five inches.

—Herbert S. Johnson, Pastor of Warren Avenue Baptist Church, Boston.

And so of such things are Christians made. They have ever chanted of the "moral uplift" of Christianity, but the Socialist knows differently. Like all religions, this off-shoot of the holy Roman Empire has been a tool in the hands of those who are interested in human enslavement. Either as a guide to an understanding of social forces or a means of working-class emancipation from capitalist exploitation Christianity is more than useless.

To propagandists we recommend getting this booklet. Mr. Bedborough has provided us with a handy friend to help smash the false claims of our foes. ROBERTUS.

"The Western Socialist"

Published by the Socialist Party of Canada is obtainable from the Socialist Party of Canada, Manitoba Hotel, 194, Market Avenue East, Winnipeg, at five cents a copy; or at 42, Great Dover Street, London, S.E.1, at 2d. per copy (2½d. post free).

* * *

THE WORKERS' SOCIALIST PARTY (U.S.A.)

Readers in U.S.A. are invited to communicate with the Workers' Socialist Party at 192, East 23rd Street, New York City, where the SOCIALIST STANDARD is obtainable.

* * *

"SOCIALISM AND RELIGION"

48 pages. TWOPENCE 2½d. post free.

* * *

"SOCIALISM"

48 pages, price 2d. (Post free 2½d.)

Send for a copy to the LITERATURE SECRETARY, 42 Great Dover Street, S.E.1

* * *

"The Socialist Party of Great Britain and Questions of the Day"

Deals with the founding of the Socialist Party, the Liberal, Tory, Labour and Communist parties and the I.L.P., the Russian Dictatorship, War, Trade Unions, Social Reforms etc

80 Pages—Price 3d. (Post free—4d.)

Donations

A list of donations to Party funds has been crowded out of this issue.

MEETINGS and LECTURES

All of the lectures announced below are open to non-members. Admission free. Questions and discussion are welcomed.

SUNDAY MEETINGS AT HEAD OFFICE

Sunday Evenings at 8.30 p.m.

January 6th	-	"The Class Struggle."
		E. GOLDBERG
13th	-	"Zionism and Socialism."
		I. GINSBERG
20th	-	"Evolution of Property."
		R. AMBRIDGE
27th	-	"American Civil War."
		E. REGINALD
February 3rd	-	"The Scientific Method."
		E. WILMOT

SUNDAY EVENING LECTURES

The Poland Rehearsal Rooms, 49 Poland Street, Oxford Street, W.1, at 8 p.m.

January 13th	-	"Socialism—How?"
		G. BELLINGHAM.
20th	-	"Social Revolution and the Vote."
		ROBERTUS."
27th	-	"Profits and the Gods."
		C. LESTOR
February 3rd	-	"Revolutionary Lessons from Germany"
		A. KOHN

PADDINGTON

A Lecture will be given in the Guild Room, over "Co-op" Stores, 447 Harrow Road, W.10, on Friday, January 25th, at 8 p.m.

Subject	Speaker
"Abraham Lincoln."	A. Reginald.

ROMFORD

Lectures are given on alternate Mondays at 8 p.m., at N.U.R. Club, Albert Road, Romford.

BETHNAL GREEN

A Lecture will be given at Bethnal Green Library, on Friday, January 11th, at 8 p.m.

Subject	Speaker
"The Communist Party and the Class Struggle"	S. Cash

WEMBLEY

Friday Evening Lectures at Elm Hotel Annexe, St. John's Road, Wembley, at 8.0 p.m.

January 11th	-	"Marxism and Darwinism."
		C. LESTOR
25th	-	"Socialism and Religion."
		I. GINSBERG

(Continued on back page).

Meetings and Lectures—continued.

HACKNEY

Lectures are given each Friday evening at 8.30 p.m., at Old Gravel Pit Hall, Vallette Street.

January 4th	-	-	"Slavery."
			A. REGINALD
18th	-	-	"Evolution of the Machine."
			E. KERSLEY
25th	-	-	"Evolution of Property."
			R. AMBRIDGE

ISLINGTON

Lectures at Room 4, Co-operative Hall, 129 Seven Sisters Road, on Friday evenings, at 8 p.m.

January 18th	-	-	"Who are the Intelligent Class?"
			F. WALKER
February 1st	-	-	"What is Marxism?"
			HART

BLOOMSBURY

Lectures are given each Monday evening at 8.30 p.m. at A.E.U. Hall, 39 Doughty Street, Corner of Guildford Street, W.C.1.

January 7th	-	-	"Marx and Engels and the English Labour Movement."
			M. BARITZ
14th	-	-	"Has Fascism a Future?"
			ISBITSKY
21st	-	-	"The Political Theories of Karl Marx."
			A. KOHN
28th	-	-	"Philosophy of Individualism."
			DEVERAUX
February 4th	-	-	"Causes of the World Depression."
			JAMES

ILFORD

Discussion circle every Wednesday at 8 p.m., at 142 Richmond Road.

BRANCH DIRECTORY

BATTERSEA.—Sec., 2, Hanbury Road, S.W.11. Branch meets Thursday, 8.30 p.m., at The Waiting Room, Latchmere Baths, entrance in Burns Road.

BIRKENHEAD.—Communications to H. Dawson, 36, Meadow Street, Birkenhead, Cheshire.

BIRMINGHAM.—Sec., E. Jesper, 38, Rollason Road, Erdington. Branch meets Jeans Café, Newton Street. First Wednesday in month at 8 p.m.

BLOOMSBURY.—Branch meets every Monday at 7.30 p.m., at A.E.U. Hall, 39 Doughty Street, W.C. (Near Grays Inn, Road.) Sec., Miss B. Foster, 2, Old Gloucester Street, W.C.1.

CENTRAL.—Membership obtained only through the Ex. Committee. Applications to General Sec.

CHISWICK.—(See West London).

DAGENHAM.—Branch meets alternate Mondays (from August 6th) at 8 p.m., Pettitts' Farm, Heathway. Sec. J. Oliver, 87, Rogers Road, Dagenham, Essex.

ECCLES.—Branch meets 1st and 3rd Mondays in month at Railway Temperance Room, Four Bridges, Wellington Road, 7.30 p.m. Lecture and discussion, 8.45. Non-members invited. Secretary, Mrs. F. LEA, 5, Gaskell Road, Eccles, Lancs.

EDINBURGH.—Communications to Sec., D. Lamond, at 15, Barclay Place.

GLASGOW.—Branch meets 2nd and 4th Mondays in month, 8 p.m., at 98 Naburn Street, Glasgow, C.5. Communications to M. Falconer at above address.

HACKNEY.—Branch meets Friday, 7.30 p.m., at Old Gravel Pit Hall, Vallette Street, E.9. Lecture after each meeting. Communication to Sec., E. Hatwell, 36, Haggerston Road, Dalston, E.8.

HULL.—Branch meets alternate Wednesdays, at York Room, The Metropole. Communications to Sec., at 62, Ampleforth Grove, Willerby Road.

ILFORD.—Branch meets Mondays at 8 p.m. at 142, Richmond Road. Discussion after Branch business. Communications to Sec., at above address. Discussion Circle every Wednesday, at 8 p.m.

ISLINGTON.—All communications to F. W., 92, Wellington Road, Holloway, N.2. Branch meets on Fridays at 8 to 10.30 p.m., at Room 4, Co-operative Hall, 129, Seven Sisters Road, N.

LEYTON.—Communications to Sec., Mrs. E. C. Snell, 17, Theobald Road, E.17. Branch meets Thursday, 8 p.m., at Trades Hall, Grove House, High Road, Leyton.

LEWISHAM.—Branch meets Thursdays, at 8 p.m., at The Anchor Club Room, Lewisham Road. Communications to H. A. Russell, 73, Kimberley Road, Nunhead, S.E.15.

MANCHESTER.—Branch meets fortnightly (Mondays) as from 14 Jan., at Craigwell Restaurant, Peter Street (entrance in South Street). Sec., B. A. Lee, 19, Emery Avenue, Chorlton, Manchester.

PADDINGTON.—Branch meeting held on 2nd Friday, and lecture with discussion on 4th Friday in each month, 8 p.m., in the guild room over "Co-op. Stores," 447, Harrow Road, W.10. Literature Sec., W. Veal, 73, Wornington Road, W.10.

ROMFORD.—Branch meets on Mondays at 8 p.m., N.U.R. Club, Albert Road, Romford. Non-members invited. Lecture and discussion on alternate Mondays. Secy. Lindley E. Lock, 327, Rush Green Road, Romford.

SHEFFIELD.—Sec., G. H. Southey, 83, Wallace Road, Sheffield, 3. Branch meets alternate Mondays, 7.30 p.m. at Room 2, A.E.U. Institute, Stanley Street.

SOUTHEND-ON-SEA.—Branch meets 1st and 3rd Wednesday in the month, at 8 p.m. at 6, Hermitage Road, Westcliff. Discussion after branch business. Non-members invited. Communications to Sec. at above address.

SOUTHWARK.—Branch meets Fridays at 8 p.m., 42, Great Dover St., S.E.1. Communications to Sec., at above address.

STEPNEY.—Sec., S. Goldstein, 18, Irene House, Flower & Dene Street, Stepney, E.1. Branch meets on Fridays, at 8 p.m., at Working Lads Institute (nr. Whitechapel Station).

TOOTING.—Sec., W. Mehew, 19, Littleton Street, S.W.18. Branch meets 1st Sunday in the month, at 12 a'clock at "The Springfield Social Club," 590, Garrett Lane, S.W.17 (Opposite Burntwood Lane).

TOTTENHAM.—Branch meets 1st and 3rd Fridays in the month, 7, Bruce Grove, Room 2. Discussion after branch business. Public invited. Communications to C. Godfrey, 49, Napier Road, Tottenham, N.17.

WALTHAMSTOW.—Branch meets every Wednesday at 8 p.m. at the Workman's Hall (Room 2), High Street, E.17. Sec., Clifford Beloe, 158, Northcote Road, Walthamstow, E.17. Lecture and discussion on alternate Wednesdays.

WEST HAM.—Sec., P. Hallard, 22, Colegrave Road, Stratford, E. Branch meets Whitehall Schools, Parliament Place, Forest Gate, every Thursday at 8 p.m.

WEST LONDON (Chiswick).—Branch meets Fridays, 8 p.m., at Chiswick Club, over 376, High Road, Chiswick, W.4. Communications to Sec., C. Curtis, 52, Parkstead Road, Putney, S.W.15.

WEMBLEY.—Communications to H. G. Holt, 28, Charterhouse Avenue, Wembley, Middlesex. Branch meets every Friday at 8 p.m. in the Elm Hotel Annexe, St. John's Road, off High Road, Wembley.

WOOD GREEN.—Communications to Sec. at 44, Boreham Road, Wood Green, N.22. Branch meets 2nd and 4th Wednesday in month at 8.30 p.m., Stirling House, Stuart Crescent.

THE SOCIALIST STANDARD

The Official Organ of **THE SOCIALIST PARTY** of Great Britain.

*Privilege is
a Prop for
the Rich . . .
and a Rod
for the Poor.*

□

No. 364. Vol. 31]

London, February, 1935

[Monthly, Twopence

The Coming Struggle in India

EASTERN WORKERS ENSNARED

Anyone who hopes to understand the so-called "Indian problem" by reading the statements of the mouthpieces of the various British and Indian interests is certain to be disappointed. Never was any question so fogged and obscured by half-truths, conventional lies and appeals to imaginary principles. The overshadowing lie is that it is a non-economic, "Nationalist" question fought by Britain on the one side and India on the other. That conception is a figment of the imagination, of the greatest convenience, however, to those on the one side and the other who fear more than anything else that the truth should become widely known.

That "India" is oppressed by "Britain," is a fiction, just as it is a fiction that "Britain" is seeking disinterestedly to solve a problem for "India." It is a fiction because neither on the one side nor on the other have the great mass of the population any interest at stake that matters; nor have they understanding of what the issues really are. The issues can be sketched in a few words.

British capitalists have vast sums invested in India, variously estimated to amount to a stupendous total of somewhere between £500- and £1,000-millions.

British exporters, prior to the depression, were selling nearly £80-millions of goods a year in the Indian market; far more than they sold to any other country in the world. British shipping, British sea and air power, British capitalist interests in countries near and beyond India, all these direct and indirect capitalist interests are bound up with the maintenance of British control in India. On the British side, therefore, the Indian problem is a capitalist problem; not a problem of the British workers, but of those who control the Government in Great Britain—the British ruling class.

What of the other side? There, too, it is a problem of the ruling class, not of the workers and peasants, who are the great majority of the population. It is not an Indian problem, but a problem of the rich and powerful Indian princes, of the no less wealthy lords of land, lords of cotton, lords of iron and steel, and of the rest of the ruling class and their hangers-on.

Are the British ruling class self-seeking, tyrannical, callous of the interests of those whom they exploit, and prepared to use every weapon of force and cunning in defence of their class privilege? So are the Indian! Every crime against the British working class perpetrated in the past and present of British capitalism is paralleled in India by the hereditary princes and by the Indian capitalists, who prate of unity in the common cause of Indian freedom. They want freedom from the British overlordship (or rather, a convenient relaxation of it—they have no wish to lose

ON OTHER PAGES

	Page
Lecture Syllabuses ...	84
Marx and the Political Machinery ...	85
Major Douglas and Capitalism ...	86
Flaming Folly in the Saar ...	88
Stark Realities in Russia	89
Machinery and Poverty	92
Marx on Force...	94
Notes by the Way ...	94
Meetings, Lectures and Discussions -	87, 93, 95, 96

the use of British arms against their own discontented fellow Indians) because they want a larger share in the proceeds of the exploitation of the Indian workers. They do not resent the legal robbery of the Indian masses, but they do resent the flow of that wealth so largely to British investors. They are now to get a part of what they sought when they poured out money like water, stirring up the so-called nationalist agitation. The tie is to be relaxed. India is to have a greater measure of what is called "self-government," that is to say, government by the Indian ruling class, for the Indian ruling class, but in the name of the Indian masses.

The Constitutional Reforms

The reforms now being discussed by the British Parliament are briefly as follows:

Under the existing constitution of India, the central government is in the hands of officials controlled by the British Government in London. In future, when the new proposals become law, the Central Government will be responsible to a Federal All-India Legislature representing both the provinces of British India and the States ruled over by the Indian princes. The Central Government will have wide powers, but national defence, foreign relations and ecclesiastical affairs will still be in the hands of the Governor-General; that is, of the British Government.

In addition to the Central Government of India there will be provincial governments responsible to provincial assemblies. Both at the centre and in the provinces, the representatives of the British Government, i.e., the Governor-General and the Provincial Governors, will have special powers of interference and veto in certain eventualities.

The basis of election of the Federal All-India Legislature is not a direct democratic vote of the population, but an indirect system under which the provincial assemblies and the Indian States (i.e., the princes) send representatives to the Federal Legislature.

The provincial assemblies are to be directly elected, but the franchise is to be a restricted one. About 14 per cent. of the population will have votes, which may be compared with over 50 per cent. (representing practically full adult suffrage) in Great Britain. By this restriction, and by the indirect method of electing the Central Legislature, the large measure of power which the reforms will provide will be safely concentrated in the hands of India's property-owning class, to the very large exclusion of the propertyless. This, it is important to notice, was done in accordance with the views of Gandhi and other influential circles in the Indian Nationalist Movement. Gandhi has never made any secret of his unbending opposition to Socialism and his determination to resist any movement for dispossessing the princes or the Indian capitalists.

At the Round Table Conference in London, in 1932, and on many other occasions, he opposed a full adult franchise and direct elections, and defended the property rights of the privileged class. How could he, as leader of the movement, do otherwise? Would the textile millionaires who financed his campaign have allowed him to endanger their position by allowing the dispossessed Indian masses to come into their heritage? One wealthy individual alone gave Gandhi £150,000 to finance his present campaign in the villages (*Daily Herald*, November 3rd, 1934). In India, no less than in England, those who pay the piper call the tune.

Safeguards for British Capitalists

If the Indian princes and capitalists were vehemently opposed to enfranchising those on whose backs they live, the "safeguards" imposed by the British capitalists in this bargain with their Indian counterparts are no less instructive. They keep a tight hand on the armed forces of the Central Government and the question of foreign relations. They have seen to it that the Indian Government shall be precluded from taking discriminatory measures designed to penalise the Indian trading interests of British capitalists; and the consent of the British Government (via the Governor-General) is required in any matters affecting the proposed Reserve Bank of India, the coinage, or the Indian Railways.

In short, there has been a blessed compromise. British capitalist investments, trade, and Empire interests are reasonably safeguarded without any undue sacrifice. Indian capitalists are to gain certain powers, by means of which their interests will be promoted, and both together will combine to see that the basis of this whole structure of exploitation is not disturbed. Rent, interest and profit shall be secure in India as in England.

There is, however, inevitably and fortunately, a nigger in this woodpile, in the shape of movements of the Indian workers themselves. With one struggle taking on a modified form, India will eventually enter more clearly on another, which will not end until Socialism holds sway there and in all lands. At present, however, such movements are in their infancy.

Tragic Indian "Socialism"

With the growing industrialisation of India, trade unions have taken root, and with them the beginnings of political organisations having professedly working-class objects. Unfortunately, instead of learning from the mistakes of workers in European countries, the Indian workers are blindly following in the same path. Labour parties and parties calling themselves Socialist are being formed, committed from the outset to all the tragic futilities of the European "Labour" parties. One such party is the "All-India Congress Socialist

Party," formed last May. (An earlier attempt was criticised in these columns in July, 1932.) The Indian "Congress," from which the new party takes its name, is the central Indian Nationalist organisation, which, under Gandhi's leadership, has fought the battle of the Indian capitalist class behind the camouflage of "independence from British rule." The new party is a constituent part of Congress, accepts its aims and objects, subscribes to its nationalistic (and therefore anti-Socialist, anti-working-class) doctrines, and fights elections under its banner and on its programme.

True, the new party professes to be Socialist, although it has so far not attempted to embody its aims and methods in a Declaration of Principles. True, it admits that Congress, "as it is constituted, will not accept Socialism to-day" (see *Congress Socialist*, Calcutta, September 29th, 1934). But having said this, the party organ goes on to enunciate the self-same delusion which enabled almost every European "Labour" party to exploit the name Socialism while betraying everything that Socialism stands for. Thus we are told that the Congress Socialist Party is going to "convert the Congress to the Socialist viewpoint"—they might as well try to convert the British ruling class. They effectually relegate Socialism to the dim and distant future with the phrase that while Socialism "is the permanent aim . . . and has to be kept constantly in view," there are "certain secondary aims which, at the moment, assume all importance."

These aims are: "Development of the anti-Imperialist struggle through the Congress," organisation of peasants and workers' unions, etc. Readers will not, perhaps, be surprised, knowing the ways of the compromiser, to learn that these anti-Socialist proposals are put forward under a label of Marxism. Our reply is that it is the duty of a Socialist Party always and everywhere to fight for Socialism, not some day, but now.

There is no need for us to mince matters, or obscure our meaning through lack of bluntness. Those who are putting over this Congress Socialist Party, even if they are, many of them, quite sincerely muddle-headed and inexperienced at present, are doing a lasting disservice to the Socialist movement. They are perpetrating a fraud. They are acting as decoys, whether ambitious and calculating or merely innocent and misguided. They are shepherding the unfortunate Indian workers and peasants into the ranks of the nakedly capitalist Congress, just where the Indian capitalists want to have them. They are glossing over the real struggle, the struggle between the privileged and the exploited, and the struggle between Capitalism and Socialism, and bolstering up the lying, war-inciting pretence of a nationalist struggle between India and Britain. That their views on some of the aims and methods of a

Socialist party should be confused is perhaps excusable, but there is and can be no justification for those who proclaim themselves Socialist and at the same time allaying themselves with the capitalist class.

The most obvious and elementary requirement of a Socialist party is that it be built on a purely Socialist basis and be independent. From that there can be no departure, no "special occasions." Any party, whether it be the Congress Socialist Party in India, the Social-Democrats in Germany, or the Labour Party in Great Britain, which allies itself with capitalist parties or supports capitalist Governments, places itself by that act alone, outside the pale as far as Socialism is concerned. This is as true of war-time as it is of peace-time. The S.P.G.B. and its companion parties in Australia, Canada, New Zealand and U.S.A. can make the boast that never, on any occasion, have they betrayed this or any other Socialist principle. We are prepared to join hands with, and offer a comradely welcome to, all who declare their allegiance to International Socialism. We are not prepared to associate in any way with those who ally themselves with the enemies of Socialism and of the working class.

Now is the time for those in India who really desire Socialism to strike a blow for it by preparing the way for the genuine Socialist Party of India, which has yet to be formed. H.

DONATIONS

GENERAL FUND.—Central Branch, £1; Wembley Branch, £1; Tooting Branch, £1; West Ham Branch, £3; J. C., 3s.; Ghil, 10d.; P. M., 7s. 9d.; W. S. I., 10s.; M. M., 6d.; Joe, 4d.; J. C., 1s.; Jn. Bore, £1; W. G. F., 1s. 6d.; E. R., 9d.; W. B., 1s. 6d.; A. S. W., 1s. 7d.; W. W., 1s. 1d.; A. B., 2s. 6d.; M. K., 1s. 6d.; L. W., 2s. 6d.; F. J. H., 10s.; A. H. S., 5s.

SHILLING FUND.—Tag B., 2s.; H. S. H., 4s. 6d.; Card 15, 5s.; E. R., 6d.; West Ham, 4s. 6d.; Stepney, 1s. 9d.; A. J., 6d.; D. L., 9d.; Card 1, 2s. 6d.; Southend, 11s. 6d.; Card 33, 4s.; Card 12, 1s.; Lloyd, 1s.

PUBLICATION FUND.—O. J. S., £1.

DANCE and SOCIAL

on
Saturday, February 9th, at 7.30 p.m.

at the

Express Dairy, Charing Cross Road
(opposite the Alhambra).

Tickets 1/3 each
from Social Committee or Branch Secretary

"The Socialist Party of Great Britain and Questions of the Day"

Deals with the founding of the Socialist Party, the Liberal, Tory, Labour and Communist parties and the I.L.P., the Russian Dictatorship, War, Trade Unions, Social Reforms etc
80 Pages—Price 3d. (Post free—4d.)

Lecture Syllabuses

FEUDALISM.

(Lecture by Com. GOLDBERG, October 21st, 1934.)

A. FACTUAL.

1. *Antecedents.*
 - (a) East (Egypt, Asia, Mediterranean). Peasant despotisms and peasant democracies, with chattel slavery and some serfdom.
 - (b) West. Patriarchal Communism. The Mark Commune in Agriculture.
2. *Technical Basis.* Agriculture supplemented by cattle-rearing. Bronze and iron used for ploughshares and weapons.
3. *Ethical Period.* Upper stage of barbarism and beginning of civilisation. Family Patriarchal to Monogamic.
4. *Organisation.*
 - (a) Roman origins. Existence of debtor and creditor led to Patrocinium tenure. Bribery and corruption of declining Roman slave economy leads to welcoming of barbarian invaders by Roman peasants.
 - (b) Frankish developments. Charles Martel commanded Church lands to subsidise mounted force to meet Saracen invasion. This led to precarium tenure in France.
 - (c) *Classes.*
 1. *Agriculture.* King. Barons (tenants-in-chief or tenants-in-mesne). Freemen—not tied to the land. Villeins—cultivated about 30 acres. Bordars (or cottars)—cultivated 8 to 10 acres, and also hired themselves for wages. Slaves—very few in England.
 2. *Commercial.* Guild—masters; journeymen; apprentices.
 - (d) 1086, Domesday Book. 1215, Magna Carta. The Jews first appearance in England. 1265, Simon de Montfort and Model Parliament.
5. *Decline in England.*
 - (a) Germs of Capitalism. Wool trade with Flanders. Sheep-rearing led to enclosures. Growth of commerce and money economy. Expanding market.
 - (b) 1348, Black Death. Peasant unrest. One-third of population perish in B.D. Labour shortage. Attempt to re-impose labour dues. 1381, Wat Tyler's rebellion. 1450, Jack Cade's rebellion.
 - (c) War of the Roses, 1455-1485. Struggle between barons and rising burghers. Chief barons exterminated.

B. IDEOLOGICAL.

1. *Religion.* Social hierarchy reflected in clerical and heavenly hierarchy. Philosophy and speculation subordinated to theology. Church enormously wealthy and powerful. Serfdom God-ordained.
2. *Morality.* Chivalry, chastity, co-relatives of land-inheritance customs. Divorce permitted when no heir. Usury very immoral. Worst possible crime was felony, i.e., breach of faith with overlord.

C. HISTORICAL FUNCTION.

The development of a world market via the advancement of productive technique as employed in handicrafts. *Definition:* Feudalism is a system of society based upon land tenure, subject to military and/or agricultural service.

BOOKS.

Engels: Origin of the Family.
Adams: Feudalism. Encyclopædia Britannica, 1911 Edition.
Bogdanov: Short Course of Economic Science.
Stenton: English Feudalism.
Gibbins: Industrial History of England.

MERCHANT CAPITALISM.

(Lecture by Com. KOHN, October 28th, 1934.)

GEOGRAPHICAL INFLUENCES. FEUDAL BACKGROUND.

Conditions for the existence of Capitalism.

1. Growth of the Market for Commodities.
2. Accumulation of Capital.

3. Existence of a body of people without property dependent on working for others.

The Three Kinds of Capital.

1. Usurers'. 2. Merchants'. 3. Industrial.

The Period of Merchant Capitalism in Europe. 15th-18th Century.
The Beginnings. Industry and Trade. Growth of Commodity Production. Handicraft. Growth of Towns and Markets. The Merchant Guild. The Craft Guilds. Merchants of Staple. Flemish and Teutonic Hanse. Money. Struggle of the Towns against Feudal Control. Greater Division of Labour. The Break-up of the Guild System. Rise of the Wealthy Trader. The Journeyman. Growth of Class Distinctions. The Merchant Adventurers.

Later Development.

Effect of Evictions. Spread of Pauperism. Growth of a Labouring Class. The Merchant. The Manufacturer. The Domestic System. The Livery Companies. The National Rivalries for World Trade. The New World. The Old Colonial System. The Joint Stock Company. (The Levant Co., The Africa Co., The East India Co.) The Manufacturing System. The Money Market.

Political Struggles.

Absolute Monarchy. Privy Council. Star Chambers. Commercial Policy of Crown.

LAW AND MERCHANT CAPITALISM.

Economic Effects and Inventions. Navigation. Astronomy. Mechanics. Paper and Printing. Experimental Science. Spirit of Enquiry.

Influence on Culture.

The Renaissance.

Political Thought.

Bacon. Locke. Hobbes. Macchiavelli.

BOOKS TO READ.

Waters: A Short Economic History. Oxford Press, 4s.
Ashley: Introduction to Economic History.
Ashley: Economic Organisation of England.
Knight: Economic History of Europe.
Marx: Capital, Vol. I, Chapters 11, 12, 24.
Schmoller: The Mercantile System.

THE PROTESTANT REFORMATION OF 16th CENTURY.

(Lecture by Com. KOHN, November 4th, 1934.)

The Economic and Social Background (see also "Merchant Capitalism" syllabus.)

The Crusades. Discoveries and Inventions. Fall of Constantinople. The Revival of Learning. The Printed Word. The General Decay of Feudalism. Rise of Centralised State and Nation. Rise of Capital.

The Religious Change.

Wealth and Power of Gt. Med. Church. Its Feudal Character. The Spread of Heresy. Albigenses, Lollards, Hussites, etc.

The Reformation in Germany.

Luther's Attack on Church. Its popularity. The Peasants' War. The Princes—The Burghers—The Emperor. Luther's support of Princes.

The Reformation in England.

Policy of Henry VIII. Dissolution of Monasteries and the game of plunder. The National Church. The Spread of Calvinism. Its Bourgeois and Republican Character.

The Reformation and Counter-Reformation in other Lands.

Protestantism and Economic Individualism.

Individual Judgment. Revolt against Authority. "The Calling." Predestination and Economics. Thrift and Work. Bourgeois Property and Religious Ideals.

The Purpose of Reformation.

The adaption of Religious ideas and institutions of Feudalism to the economic needs and interests of Capitalism.

BOOKS OF REFERENCE.

Smith: Age of Reformation. Engels: Furbach.
Flick: Decline of Mediaeval Church.
Robertson: Economic Individualism.

THE PURITAN REVOLUTION.

The Political and Economic Situation.

Class divisions. The use of State machinery by large landowners and monarchy. Grievances of trading and capital farmer class. Need to control State to promote interests of rising capitalism. Political unity of commercial elements. Conflict clothed in religious guise.

The Armed Conflict.

The immediate causes of Civil War. Roundheads and Cavaliers. The rich House of Commons. Parliament's control over finance. The military struggle. Cromwell. The New Model Parliament and the Army. Defeat of the Royalists.

The Commonwealth

Parliamentary Policy. Social Policy. Dictatorship of Cromwell. The Restoration and its significance.

Democratic Elements in the Struggle.

Lilburne and Levellers. Winstanley and the Digger Movement.

Function of the Puritan Revolution.

The achievement of political supremacy by the trading and producing capitalist class, together with its ally, the small Capitalist landowners.

BOOKS OF REFERENCE.

Pease: The Leveller Movement.
Trevelyan: England under Stuarts.
Barnes: The Digger Movement. Gardiner: The Civil War in England.
Bernstein: Cromwell and Communism.

Marx and the Political Machinery

Below is a further letter on this subject. Earlier letters and our replies thereto were published in the November and January issues.

To the Editorial Committee, SOCIALIST STANDARD.

Dear Sirs,

I thank you again for the trouble you have taken: but the result is as it was. You have failed utterly, and will continue to fail, to find any justification for the assertion that "Marx constantly stressed the need to gain control of the political machinery"—in the sense indicated in the pamphlet, "The Socialist Party and Questions of the Day."

In this, my final contribution (the discussion cannot go on for ever), I confine myself to summarising the issue between us.

(1) The doctrine of the pamphlet is thus formulated:—

"It is necessary for the workers to obtain control of Parliament before attempting to uproot the existing foundations of society."

"The only way to obtain control (i.e., of the 'armed forces') is by the legal one of sending delegates to Parliament."

—The Socialist Party, etc., page 68.

This mechanical and exclusively legalist conception is the complete negation of the Marxian conception of the conquest of power (which conquest may or may not include, as an incidental detail, the "capture" of the "political machinery," i.e., "Parliament"). It narrows the concept of class-struggle down to a purely electoral struggle, and implies (see context from which the above extract is taken) that control of the "armed forces" of the State passes automatically into the possession of the Parliamentary majority.

This conception is the opposite of that of Marx and Engels, as every quotation from their works alike those made by you as well as those made by me proves abundantly.

It is also a conception which negates your own Declaration of Principles, in which the workers "must organise consciously and politically for the conquest of the powers of Government" [in opposition to and for the overthrow of] the existing "machinery of government."

I affirm categorically that it is false, theoretically and practically, to assert that control of the "armed forces" will pass automatically and of necessity to a Parliamentary majority. And whether this be so or not it is clearly monstrous to claim Marx or Engels as lending any sort of encouragement to the notion that it will.

This "mechanistic" view (that of the Pamphlet) is the view held by the pacifist wing of the I.L.P. and by the official Labour Party. That these bodies do not in your view have "Socialism as their aim" only makes the point against your pamphlet-doctrine all the stronger. It is the view characterised by Engels as "Parliamentary cretinism":—

"... that incurable malady Parliamentary cretinism, a disorder which penetrates its unfortunate victims with the solemn conviction that the whole world, its history and future, are governed and determined by a majority of votes in that particular representative body which has the honour to count them among its members."

ENGELS: Revolution and Counter-Revolution, p. 92.

It is the opposite of the view inculcated by Marx's *Civil War in France* (to which you refer me). For example:—

"Paris had risen, in arms, against the attempt . . . to restore and perpetuate the old governmental power bequeathed to them by the Empire. Paris could resist only because, in consequence of the siege, it had got rid of the army, and replaced it by a National Guard, the bulk of which consisted of working men. This fact was now to be transformed into an institution. The first decree of the Commune, therefore, was the suppression of the standing army and the substitution for it of the armed people" (p. 40).

"The working class . . . have no ready-made Utopias to introduce *par decret du peuple* [literally, "by Decree of the People"]—the French Republican formula for "by Act of Parliament". They know that in order to work out their own emancipation . . . they will have to pass through long struggles, through a series of historic processes, transforming circumstances and men" (p. 44).

"The working class cannot simply lay hold of the ready-made State machinery and wield it for its own purposes" (p. 37).

This last sentence you interpret to mean that "they must lay hold of it" and in only one way—a way never mentioned by Marx, that of purely legal, and exclusively constitutional "capture." Only after this will the workers "modify" the machine, "and then use it." That is to say, the only power (of coercion) you conceive it indispensable for the workers to acquire is the purely legal Parliamentary majority control over the existing Army, etc.

This may be your view; as it is the view of the Labour Party.

It is not the view of Marx.

I am content to leave the matter for your readers to judge.

Yours truly,

JOHN HAWKINS.

REPLY.

Our correspondent has so shifted his ground in his second and third letters that anyone reading the third letter (printed above) without having read the earlier ones would have little idea what is the point at issue. The first letter from Mr. Hawkins dealt

with one point and one point only, that is, whether or not we were correct in claiming that Marx constantly stressed the need to gain control of the political machinery. We have given a number of quotations from Marx and Engels, in which they asserted exactly what we claim. Instead of trying to show us a single quotation indicating that Marx did not think it necessary to gain control of the political machinery, Mr. Hawkins slides away into discussing (a) the "sense" in which we used our very plain and simple phrase; (b) the method by which the political machinery is to be gained control of; (c) whether or not that control will "automatically" give control of the armed forces; (d) the way in which Mr. Hawkins thinks we ought to have phrased our Declaration of Principles, but didn't; (e) the aims of the Labour Party and the pacifist wing of the I.L.P., and (f) Engel's view on some theories and activities quite unlike those of the S.P.G.B., views which Engels describes as "Parliamentary cretinism."

All of this is very interesting, but if it was intended to divert our attention from Mr. Hawkins's unwillingness to deal with the point at issue, it is a failure.

The last few paragraphs of Mr. Hawkins's letter do have bearing on this point, but only incidentally. We referred him to Marx's "Civil War in France," and reminded him that Marx's assertion about the impossibility of using the ready-made State machinery without modifying it, was bound up with the need of first gaining control of it. Now, by implication, Mr. Hawkins accepts this, but as usual he hastens to ride off on a discussion about the *method* of gaining control.

The various new points now introduced by Mr. Hawkins and which are irrelevant to the present issue have been dealt with often in these columns. Readers who are interested in them and in the original question under discussion with Mr. Hawkins are referred to the previous correspondence (November and January, SOCIALIST STANDARD), to the Answers to Correspondents in January, to the Correspondence, "Parliament or Soviet," in August and December, 1930, and to the Answers to Correspondents in November, 1933.

In conclusion, we repeat that Marx (and Engels) constantly stressed the need to gain control of the political machinery. Mr. Hawkins's inability to produce passages from Marx in conflict with this, and his manifest desire to discuss any and every point but the one at issue, serve to confirm our view.

ED. COMM.

"SOCIALISM"

48 pages, price 2d. (Post free 2½d.)

Send for a copy to the LITERATURE SECRETARY,
42 Great Dover Street, S.E.1

Major Douglas and Capitalism

The Socialist exposure of the fallacies of the Douglas Movement is ignored by the Movement's supporters, and public debate is avoided in this country by them. Yet, in the official organ of the Social Credit Secretariat, we find the following:—

The introduction of Social Credit would banish poverty immediately. This fact has been established and proved again and again by virtue of the inability of all opposition to disprove its claims.

—(Social Credit, November 30th, 1934.)

We would like to refer all supporters of Social Credit back to the SOCIALIST STANDARDS of May, June and July, 1932, and February, 1934, where their case is dealt with; in the meantime let us analyse certain statements made by the Douglasites.

From a memorandum submitted to the Prime Minister by the Douglas Social Credit Association of Southampton, we select the two following passages (there are seven in all):—

4. Under the existing system money is distributed only in return for work within the economic field.

5. The purpose of our economic system being to provide for the well-being of the entire community, the available plenty should be distributed so that the resulting security is ensured to every man, woman and child. . . .

—(Social Credit, November 30th.)

If the writers of these two statements will deign to look a little more closely at this "entire community," they will see that it is divided into two classes—one relatively small in numbers, the other embracing the mass of the people. The former class is an owning class; between them, its members own the factories, mines, railways, etc., and consequently are exempt from working, for the simple reason that they draw dividends on their "shares," etc. Hence they can spend their time freed from the necessity of finding employment. They can travel, study, cultivate the arts, go in for sport, etc., and enjoy themselves generally. The other class is, however, propertyless. Its members, as a rule, own little, but their power to work. In order to live, they must sell their labour-power to, and produce things for, the aforementioned class.

Again, if these supporters of Social Credit looked carefully, they would see that the present system does not exist "to provide for the well-being of the entire community," but for the benefit of the owning or capitalist class. A proof of this is seen from the fact that when the capitalists do not receive profits from production, mines and factories are closed down. The worker is able to work only when production enriches the small minority, the capitalist class.

Lastly, watch these two classes for but a brief period, and even the Douglasites will see that they are ever in conflict, the one with the other. The capitalist class is ever trying to increase its profits at the expense of the working class, and the workers

are ever trying to increase their wages at the expense of the capitalists—hence, lock-outs and strikes. The class-struggle between the owning class and the working class is a glaring fact. Yet the Douglasites, through ignorance or because many of their own supporters are capitalists, desire to throw dust in the eyes of the workers, and try to hush up this antagonism of interests.

Fellow workers, study Socialism and you will not be at the mercy of these, or any other, agents of the capitalist class. C. A.

A NEW BRANCH AT LEWISHAM

The Lewisham Branch of the Party is now in full running order. Spite of unfavourable weather, a number of successful outdoor meetings have been held. The summer season is looked forward to with confidence.

It is hoped to make a special feature of indoor monthly lectures in the near future.

There is every evidence that sympathisers with the Party and earnest seekers for the way to working-class emancipation abound in Lewisham. We extend a hearty invitation to all such to attend Branch meetings held weekly above the "Anchor," at 8.30 p.m. As a rule, general discussion is possible after routine Branch business. Outdoor meeting every Sunday, at 7.30, Avenue Road, near Clock Tower.

The "Anchor" is a minute from Lewisham Junction Station.

Answers to Correspondents

"Trade Unionist."—We do not publish replies to anonymous letters. If you care to let us have your name and address, not necessarily for publication, we will reply to your questions. ED. COM.

* * * * *

East London Divisional Branches

An aggregate meeting of members will take place at Old Gravel Pit Hall, Vallette Street, Hackney, on Friday, February 8th, at 8 p.m.

* * * * *

EDUCATIONAL COURSE FOR PARTY MEMBERS.

Classes will be held at HEAD OFFICE on Sundays from 4 p.m. to 6 p.m., as follows:—

February 3rd	-	-	-	"Science."
" 10th	-	-	-	"Art"
" 17th	-	-	-	"Psychology"
" 24th	-	-	-	"Theories of Value Before Marx"
March 3rd	-	-	-	"Marxian Theory of Value"

* * * * *

Speakers' Training Class

A Speakers' Training Class intended mainly for those attending Classes is held at Head Office each Sunday from 3 p.m. to 4 p.m., conducted by Comrades Cameron, Lester and Stewart.

MEETINGS and LECTURES

All of the lectures announced below are open to non-members. Admission free. Questions and discussion are welcomed.

BROMLEY PUBLIC HALL.

A lecture will be given at Bromley Public Hall, Bow Road, E., on Sunday, February 17th, at 8 p.m.

For further particulars as to subject and speakers, see local press.

SUNDAY MEETINGS AT HEAD OFFICE

Lectures are given every Sunday evening at Head Office, 42 Great Dover Street, S.E.1, at 8.30 p.m.

February 3rd	-	-	"The Scientific Method."
			E. WILMOT
10th	-	-	"Critique of Political Economy"
			S. ROSS
17th	-	-	"Further Research into Marxism."
			M. BARITZ
24th	-	-	"The Class Struggle in Russia."
			M. CAMERON

BLOOMSBURY

Lectures will be given on Monday evenings at A.E.U. Hall, 39, Doughty Street, (Corner of Guildford Street), W.C.1. at 8.30 p.m.

February 4th	-	-	"Causes of the World Depression"
			JAMES.
" 11th	-	-	"Political Economy before Marx"
			GOLDSTEIN.
" 18th	-	-	"Evolution of Socialist Thought"
			STEWART.
" 25th	-	-	"The Museums as a Source of Socialist Education"
			KERSLEY.

ISLINGTON

Lectures at Room 4, Co-operative Hall, 129 Seven Sisters Road, on Friday evenings, at 8 p.m.

February 15th	-	-	"Are Leaders Necessary?"
			F. WILTSHIRE
March 1st	-	-	"Socialist Organisation and a United Front."
			T. ALLEN

SUNDAY EVENING LECTURES

The Poland Rehearsal Rooms, 49 Poland Street, Oxford Street, W.1, at 8 p.m.

PADDINGTON

A Lecture will be given in the Guild Room, over "Co-op" Stores, 447 Harrow Road, W.10, on Friday, February 22nd, at 8 p.m.

Subject	Speaker
"Materialism."	Wilmot.

WEMBLEY

Friday Evening Lectures at Elm Hotel Annexe, St. John's Road, Wembley, at 8.0 p.m.

February 8th	-	-	"The Wages System in Russia"
			A. KOHN
22nd	-	-	"Art, Advertisement and Adulteration"
			E. KERSLEY

(For other meetings see pages 93 and 95).

THE SOCIALIST STANDARD

FEBRUARY,



1935

OFFICIAL NOTICE

All communications for the Executive Committee. Subscriptions for the *SOCIALIST STANDARD*, Articles, and Correspondence submitted for insertion therein, should be addressed—The Socialist Party of Great Britain, 42, Great Dover Street, London, S.E.1, to whom Money Orders should be made payable.

The meetings of the Executive Committee are held at the Head Office, every Tuesday, at 7.30 p.m.

TERMS OF SUBSCRIPTIONS.

Twelve Months, post free	2s. 6d.
Six Months, post free	1s. 3d.

Flaming Folly in the Saar

In an editorial entitled "Flaming Patriotism," one of the less vicious of Lord Rothermere's newspapers, the *Evening News*, tells us (January 15th) what the Saarlanders have done, and why. Before considering his Lordship's contribution to world hysteria, let us cast an eye over some other contributions. A great battle has been fought and won. A glorious triumph has been achieved by the enthusiasts for reunion with Germany. The small band of supporters of continued administration by the League of Nations, and the microscopic handful favourable to France are correspondingly depressed. But what are they fighting about, these Saarland workers? What would they gain by any of the three courses open to them? What did they stand to lose? The Communists gave one answer. The Communists, who in Russia suppress every independent trade union or political party, told the Saar workers that Hitler would suppress their independent trade unions and political parties. So little did the workers care about this that they voted in overwhelming numbers for Hitler. The I.L.P., which for years has advocated returning the Saar to Germany, and which denounces the League of Nations as an imperialist instrument, implored the Saarland workers on no account to return to Germany, but to remain under the League. The Liberals and Labourites all wept bitter tears over the awful fate which would befall the workers under Hitler, forgetful of the fact that large numbers, if not a majority of the workers already under Hitler apparently find life so little different from what it was under the German Labour Governments and Coalitions that they do not mind, or are even enthusiastic Nazis. But

none of these parties, nor the legions of journalists and expert commentators who have overrun the Saar, have told us what there was at issue which merited the bitter campaign.

Let us, then, seek an answer from Lord Rothermere, for his organ is at least definite. It tells us that the Saarlanders were stirred by the call of race and language and blood. Seemingly this was so attractive that for it "they willingly face the chances of poverty and unemployment." Mark those last words well. They contain the distilled wisdom of a great capitalist newspaper. They are a mark both of the impudence of the capitalist Press and of the simplicity of the non-Socialist mass of workers who read it. The Saarland workers, we are told, have voted for re-union with Germany, even though it means the "material hardship" of poverty and unemployment! Just think of it. We are asked to believe that members of the working class only suffer poverty and unemployment in Germany, and that if they remained under the League or joined France they would escape these things. The tragedy is that there are British workers, intelligent and experienced in many things, but not yet intelligent in politics, who will read the *Evening News* and believe what they read, though it flies in the face of all working-class experience everywhere. And there are Saarland workers subject to just the same paralysis of the mind, so that when they read the lying propaganda of their masters, or the stupid nonsense of their Labour and Communist leaders, they believe it. What are the facts of the situation? The Saar is capitalist. It has capitalism to the west of it and to the east of it, north of it and south of it. Everywhere the means of production and distribution are owned and controlled by the master-class. Everywhere the workers produce wealth for others to own. Everywhere poverty and the risk of unemployment are the normal features of working-class life. Yet, knowing this, so-called leaders and counsellors of the Saarland workers, at home and abroad, egged them on to take sides in this master-class dispute about the ownership of the Saar. Members of the working class were thus divided into two bitterly antagonistic groups about the momentous question whether the proceeds of their own exploitation should flow to capitalists under the French or German or League flags!

What was needed in the Saar and what would have happened had there been any organised Socialist (as distinct from reformist) movement, was a clear presentation of the Socialist case. The workers would have been shown that their interests were not at stake in this Capitalist bickering, and that the surface differences between French and German and League capitalism are not vital, and cannot be dealt with by the working up of national hatreds. The workers would have been shown that the prime need of the occasion, as of every occasion, was a demonstration that they could no longer be drawn into

capitalist rivalries, but stood for the abolition of capitalism, without conditions and without delay. Even as a minority gesture an organised Socialist refusal to vote for either of the three forms of capitalist administration would have done more to proclaim the message of Socialism, and would have caused more consternation to the capitalists on both sides of the frontier than all the misdirected efforts of the anti-Hitler United Front. The organisers of that movement failed to seize the opportunity of putting the Socialist case because they do not know what the Socialist case is. They displayed their courage and energy in a worthless cause.

The result, in the absence of a Socialist movement among the Saarland workers, is that Hitler and Lord Rothermere, and the capitalists of all the countries in all the world are able to sit back, reassured that they and their system are still safe, safe behind the patriotic and capitalistic illusions of the working class.

Stark Realities in Russia

Early in December, Kirov, Communist leader and friend of Stalin, was assassinated by a 30-year-old Communist. In due course the latter and 13 associates, as well as 103 other persons, were executed. When M. Maisky, the Soviet Ambassador, received a deputation from the Trades Union Congress and Labour Party about the executions, he defended them and the manner in which they were carried out—i.e.,

without open trial—on the ground that the prisoners had been found guilty of preparing and carrying out terroristic acts (*Daily Herald*, January 3rd). Many of those who were arrested and executed were not

directly concerned with the Kirov murder, but were arrested on other charges. The Government felt, however, that the assassination of Kirov made it "imperative to expedite the investigation of all pending terroristic cases, as well as the trials in court." The majority of those executed are stated to have come from abroad and to have been carrying bombs, revolvers and other weapons. The Russian Government explained that the persons responsible for the assassination were associated with the Trotsky - Zinoviev - Kamenef groups of Communists or ex-Communists, and on the strength of this, certain punitive or precautionary measures were taken against them, Zinoviev being sentenced to 10 years' imprisonment and loss of property. An unnamed foreign Power was also mentioned as being interested.

Here we have the elements of a situation which has no difficulties for members of the Communist Party, or for the blind worshippers of everything Russian, but which presents some interesting aspects on serious examination. Let us dismiss from consideration the persons who are alleged to have entered Russia from abroad bent on acts of terrorism, and possibly

with the backing of a foreign Power. That such organisations exist in countries outside Russia is reasonably certain. What exactly the terrorists might have to say in their own defence we do not

THE SOCIALIST PARTY OF GREAT BRITAIN

OBJECT.—The establishment of a system of society based upon the common ownership and democratic control of the means and instruments for producing and distributing wealth by and in the interest of the whole community.

DECLARATION OF PRINCIPLES

THE SOCIALIST PARTY of Great Britain HOLDS—

That society as at present constituted is based upon the ownership of the means of living (i.e., land, factories, railways, etc.) by the capitalist or master class, and the consequent enslavement of the working class, by whose labour alone wealth is produced.

That in society, therefore, there is an antagonism of interests, manifesting itself as a class struggle, between those who possess but do not produce, and those who produce but do not possess.

That this antagonism can be abolished only by the emancipation of the working class from the domination of the master class, by the conversion into the common property of society of the means of production and distribution, and their democratic control by the whole people.

That as in the order of social evolution the working class is the last class to achieve its freedom, the emancipation of the working class will involve the emancipation of all mankind without distinction of race or sex.

That this emancipation must be the work of the working class itself.

That as the machinery of government, including the armed forces of the nation, exists only to conserve the monopoly by the capitalist class of the wealth taken from the workers, the working class must organise consciously and politically for the conquest of the powers of government, national and local, in order that this machinery, including these forces, may be converted from an instrument of oppression into the agent of emancipation and the overthrow of privilege, aristocratic and plutocratic.

That as all political parties are but the expression of class interests, and as the interest of the working class is diametrically opposed to the interests of all sections of the master class, the party seeking working-class emancipation must be hostile to every other party.

THE SOCIALIST PARTY of Great Britain, therefore, enters the field of political action determined to wage war against all other political parties, whether alleged labour or avowedly capitalist, and calls upon the members of the working class of this country to muster under its banner to the end that a speedy termination may be wrought to the system which deprives them of the fruits of their labour, and that poverty may give place to comfort, privilege to equality, and slavery to freedom.

Those agreeing with the above principles and desiring enrolment in the Party should apply for membership form to secretary of nearest branch or at Head Office.

know. As, however, terroristic acts cannot be the road to Socialism, and as capitalist Powers do not instigate such acts for any but capitalistic purposes, we need not concern ourselves with the actions taken by the Russian Government to deal with them. But what of the others? What of Nikolayeff, the assassin, and his associates, and the Zinoviev-Kamenev batch of prisoners—members of the Communist Party? Here we are dealing with Bolsheviks of long standing. Some of them were young men, whose whole adult life had been lived under Bolshevik rule and Bolshevik institutions, and the unceasing Bolshevik propaganda. Yet they were driven by the forces influencing them, to come out as open and violent opponents of Russia's rulers, and to go to the lengths of murdering a member of the Government, said to have been personally liked and widely popular.

If Russia is the land of universal hope, progress and satisfaction, as the Soviet authorities and their foreign visitors so often aver, why this outrage? What were the forces driving the assassins to their desperate protest?

Again, what does M. Maisky mean when he says that the Government "found it imperative" to expedite the trials and executions? If the Russian population as a whole is behind its Government why should that Government become panic-stricken because of the incursion of a few hundred terrorists from abroad? What are they afraid of? Two explanations suggest themselves, both of which are probably true. One is that there are in Russia considerable numbers of individuals and illegal groups dissatisfied with the condition of things. The record is that the Russian dictators suffer from the panicky fears which haunt all dictators. They cannot hear of any individual crazy act without imagining vast underground conspiracies. They are the victims of their own rotten system, and have themselves to thank for it. Twelve years ago, when in open trial, members of the former Soviet-Revolutionary Party were sentenced to death for terrorism, they were reprieved as a mark of the strength of the Soviet Government. Does that Government now feel less strong?

The charge that Zinoviev, Trotsky, etc., were implicated seems, on the face of it, fantastic. There is nothing in their political and personal records or their present circumstances to make any such action credible. Trotsky, who is in France, and therefore able to express his views, denies the whole story (see *Forward*, January 5th, 1935). He is also reported to have levelled an equally unsubstantiated charge that the murder of Kirov was, in fact, instigated by the Soviet secret police as a means of discrediting the opposition.

No attention need be paid to wild assertions of this kind, presented on mere suspicion, but we are entitled to ask what is the political and economic situation in Russia which can give rise to assassina-

tions of Communists by Communists, and to panic-stricken counter terrorism against dissident Communists by the rulers of that country.

The likely explanation is that Stalin and his associates live in perpetual fear of any kind of organisation, however harmless it may appear. They are apprehensive that scattered and unconnected discontent may gather itself round these fallen leaders, not so much because their particular theories are shared, but simply as rallying points against the present rulers. That is dictatorship running true to type. That is why the dominant Party savagely represses opposition parties and its own disgruntled members. It is worth remembering in this connection that Russian jails and other penal settlements contain large numbers of former members of the Communist Party, imprisoned for their political views and activities because any form of political propaganda and organisation against the ruling clique is illegal. In a letter published by the *Militant* (New York, April 15th, 1933) Trotsky stated that the numbers run to many thousands, and that their plight in many cases is a desperate one, of "unbearable physical privation," due to insufficiency of food and clothing in prisons and places of exile—"Never before have the deported suffered such privations as to-day."

Soviet Rule by "Bureaucracy and Bayonets"

Perhaps the most revealing defence of Bolshevik rule came from the pen of a non-Communist admirer of Russian methods and achievements—Mr. Hamilton Fyfe, Labour candidate and publicist, formerly Editor of the *Daily Mirror*, war correspondent of the *Daily Mail*, author of a life of Lord Northcliffe, British Government war propagandist, for several years Editor of the *Daily Herald*. On January 3rd the *Daily Herald* published an article by Mr. Fyfe explaining and defending what he himself described as the "Terror" waged by the Russian Government. His line of defence was that the way the Czars governed Russia, by the methods of "Bureaucracy and bayonets," by "executing and exiling," is the only way, because "the mass of the Russian people would not for a long time be able to understand anything else."

"Most of them accept suppression and violence as inevitable without thinking about it. They have always been accustomed to such methods. They would find it as hard to imagine government without them as we should to think of doing without elections, House of Commons debates and divisions, Acts of Parliament."

In fairness to the *Daily Herald* it must be stated that they strongly dissociated themselves from the views of Mr. Fyfe, pointing out quite truly that this is precisely the defence of Governmental terrorism in India and Germany. It was the defence used by the British authorities for the Black and Tan terrorism in Ireland. What is more, it was—as Mr. Fyfe admits—the defence pleaded by the Czarist Government.

We would like to have Mr. Fyfe and his Communist admirers face up to the implications of this argument. If it is true that Czarist terror bred a population fit only for terrorism, and Communist terrorism carries on the Czarist tradition, when and how will it end? Was it for this that the Czar's Government was overthrown? What has become of all the Communist talk about re-educating the population, and bringing them up with new ideas? What has happened to all the marvellous machinery of propaganda about which the Bolsheviks boasted? A very large proportion of the existing population have lived all or nearly all their adult lives in the period since the Czar was overthrown. Yet we have Mr. Fyfe, who is supposed to know the old and the new Russia well, telling us that the mass of the population only understand much the same Czarist "mixture of bureaucracy and bayonets." Mr. Fyfe tells us that the peasants, "left almost totally uninstructed by the Tsardom . . . are credulous, very easily influenced by a plausible talker, unable to form clear ideas about anything outside their own limited experience." Here, indeed, is a double-edged apology for the terror. A large part of the population are young enough to have been at schools or adult training institutions under the Bolsheviks, for the Czar was overthrown 18 years ago. The whole population has been subjected to the intensive propaganda of which we have heard so much. And the result, we are told, is that the Russian Government must be terroristic because the population are "credulous, very easily influenced by a plausible talker."

There is both truth and falsehood in Mr. Fyfe's case. The truth is that there never was a chance of the Bolsheviks turning the population of Russia over to an understanding of and desire for Socialism by means of propaganda from above. The S.P.G.B., knowing full well the slow and laborious nature of the task of removing capitalist ideas from the workers' minds, never for a moment accepted the glib assurance of the Communists that the Russian population had been converted to Socialism overnight in 1917, or that a minority in control of the machinery of Government could impose a change of ideas and social system by force. On the other hand, we did not accept the view then, nor do we now, that the mass of the Russian or any other population is composed of besotted idiots, responsive only to terrorism, and incapable of learning to work democratic machinery. That is a lie invented by the Czars and Kaisers, and now carried on by the Bolsheviks and Mr. Fyfe. It may very well be true that the Soviet Government, at the present moment, is faced with individual acts or organised conspiracies dangerous to their lives and their hold on power, but, if so, the fault is largely their own. It is they who gloried in the dictatorship and in the suppression of every vestige of legal political organisation and propaganda by non-

Bolsheviks. It is they who carried on and enlarged the old system of police spying and terrorism, secret courts, arbitrary executions and imprisonments, and the persecution of political opponents. If they had really wanted to get rid of it they had to start at some stage or other allowing democratic methods to replace dictatorship. In their own eyes they have, of course, the best of all possible reasons for not doing so. They believed that the advent of Socialism depended on them and their dictatorship, and they feared that a population, given the opportunity of choosing its own rulers and policies, might eventually turn away from Stalin and the Communists. It is quite certain that many changes of policy would be called for, and the many privileges of power and comparative affluence enjoyed by the ruling party might be curtailed. The only sense, therefore, in which it is true that long years of terroristic government are essential, is that the alternative was highly distasteful to the Bolshevik rulers. In short, as democracy meant their possible loss of power, they were against democracy, and firm believers in Mr. Fyfe's theory that the Russian masses are only fit for terrorism.

One little event in Bolshevik history makes nonsense of Mr. Fyfe's plausible argument that it is the benighted Russian population which does not want or could not use freedom of speech and of the Press and of meetings, and Parliamentary Government. That event was the destruction of these things after the Bolsheviks came to power. When they were striving to obtain power they never put such a view forward. On the contrary, they solemnly pledged themselves to call a democratically-elected constituent assembly. It was duly elected, met, and was destroyed by violence. Whose violence? The violence of peasants who do not "understand anything else"? Not at all. The violence of the Bolshevik Government, which swept away the Assembly because it did not return a majority congenial to themselves.

In conclusion, we need only repeat that the Fyfe-Stalin view is not the Socialist view. Socialism will make headway by the method of converting the workers to Socialism by the appeal to understanding. The Socialist case is in line with working-class interests and with social progress, and can be shown to be so. In the meantime, while the mass of the workers do not understand and want Socialism, there is nothing to do but carry on with the work of propaganda and organisation. There are no short cuts such as the Bolshevik method of trying to impose a new social system from above, and if the Bolshevik rulers of Russia believe that the Russian population is fit only for terrorism, so much the worse for Bolshevism. H.

"SOCIALISM AND RELIGION"

48 pages. TWOPENCE 2½d. post free.

Machinery and Poverty

A prominent factor in industry to-day is the extensive use of machinery. There is a disposition on the part of the casual observer to ascribe all the poverty, especially unemployment, to this cause. This is brought to our mind by the perusal of a letter sent to the Press from a person who, in bemoaning his own unfortunate position, that of being unemployed, attributes this to the use of machinery in business.

He claims that the unemployed are the victims of machinery, and appeals to those in power to "treat them as human beings," and to do all they can to alleviate the lot of those who are in a very grave position through no fault of their own.

This idea that the machine is the cause of the workers' troubles is a very mischievous one. It is only a half-truth, which has all the appearance of being an honest-to-goodness fact. It dates from the time when the first effects of machinery were felt, and the people took to smashing the machines which were stealing their bread. In spite of the machine-smashers, who were taught a painful lesson by the masters, machinery has been brought more and more into operation, and has of necessity continuously displaced labour from certain occupations. We still get this outcry against the machine, but the days of the machine-breakers are over. The capitalist class has taught the workers that private property is sacred and its violation is followed by swift retribution. It is equally useless for the worker to address urgent appeals to the masters to "treat them as human beings." Sob-stuff versus the machine. Do they expect the capitalist class to willingly hand out largesse to those who are definitely an increasing burden upon profits. Human beings, as such, are not the master's concern; he does not run a factory to please humanity, but to produce profit. When it ceases to be profitable it ceases to run. These are the "essentials of business competition," which the workers as a whole would do well to recognise. Does the question of poverty and unemployment rest upon the mechanisation of industry? This, to be true, would have to have for its proof the fact that in early times there were no destitute, and that poverty, for the mass of the people, only arose with the use of machinery and capitalist development.

This is not so, as history gives us ample proof. Poverty for one section of the people, and plenty for the other section, has existed in varying degrees ever since the commencement of private property. The slaves in ancient Greece and Rome are a classic example of this. True, the masterless man (the equivalent of the unemployed of to-day) was unheard of, but the condition of the slaves of those times and their counterparts of less than a hundred years ago in America are evidence of the poverty and unhappiness which private property relationships bring. In feudal times the lives of the population

as a whole were on a frugal standard. Comforts such as we deem necessities to-day were undreamt of, but even so, we find the lords of the manor and the various propertied people had access to better conditions, and the few luxuries obtainable, which were denied to the rest of the people. With the development of the powers of exploitation and oppression this gulf is widened. In 1601 the poverty of the people gave rise to the Poor Law, and since then relief of one sort or another has been forthcoming. The Industrial Revolution, that dates roughly from 1800, not only saw an increase in poverty and misery for the working class, but a new factor appeared in the capitalist private property relationship, which gives rise to the special feature of our times, that of unemployment. This new factor was the complete divorcement of the worker from the tools of production. The land enclosures drove numbers off the land into the towns. Here they were absorbed into the factories and workshops swiftly springing up all around. The developing commerce with newly-discovered lands, allied to the available labour power, gave the necessary impetus for invention, and machinery ushered in the Industrial Revolution. The capitalist class became now the owners of large industrial plants, employing in the aggregate several millions of work-people, and producing for a market whose requirements they were never able to estimate. Hence, at a time when new markets gave rise to big demands, production was pushed forward at top speed until the inevitable result occurred, the over-flooding of the market for various articles. As soon as demand slackened off and the capitalists were left with huge stocks of commodities a panic arose. Production was curtailed. This threw numbers of workers on to relief of different kinds, which helped to further enhance the slump owing to their decreased purchasing power. Business came to a standstill, and what is known as a crisis developed. From 1800 to the present year has been a succession of booms and slumps. New industries are continually developing, and these absorb more workers, while old industries are re-organising. There is a shifting army of unemployed; sometimes it is less, sometimes more. Machinery is playing a big part, that, possibly, of the conductor to the orchestra, but let us not ascribe the whole performance to the conductor's baton.

Where machinery is profitable to use it is used extensively, but there are still areas of production where labour power is cheaper. Where production for profit, that is, for a market whose needs are not ascertainable in advance, is carried on, there are bound to be booms and slumps ad infinitum. Until the workers recognise this and inaugurate production for use instead of for profit, so long will the capitalist system turn and turn again in its efforts to solve the problems that are of its own making,

the inevitable results of the private property relationship in society.

Because of the divorcement of the worker from the tools of production, the issue to-day is much clearer. Face to face to-day stand the two classes. The master class and the working class. The interests of these two classes are opposed to each other. The master class owns and controls the instruments of wealth production, and has at its command the armed forces of the State wherewith to enforce its laws, based and framed upon its property rights and needs. The other class, the vast mass of the people, are in bondage. The first necessity in their lives is to find a master. One who will buy from them their power to labour—their only asset. They contract to work for their master for a certain time, irrespective of how much they produce in that time. It is obvious that the amount they produce and the amount they receive back in the form of wages must be different, or else there would be no profit for the capitalist. The workers' wages enable them to buy a portion of the goods which they have collectively produced. The reward for their labours usually just about covers the cost of living in the station of life in which "it has pleased God" to place them. Thus, at the end of the week or month we find them with just enough money to tide them over until they have worked for another period. The workers produce by the labours of their mind and muscle goods for the market. When they leave the factories the goods they have produced and the machinery and plant they have used are no concern of theirs; they belong to the masters. The machinery in the process of time, undergoes changes, which make it more productive and relieve the workers of part of their labours. As a consequence, part of the staff is not required, and gets notice to quit. Wherever they seek they find a similar thing has happened, and it is very difficult for them to become employed again. The needs of the market have been supplied, and until the market improves or the surplus is used up they remain idle. Here is the opportunity for leisure in which to enjoy the beautiful things of life, but the workers find that no work means semi-starvation, and more and more of the ugly side of life. This machine age has been instrumental in producing not only the necessities of life in abundance, but luxuries and comforts undreamed of in any other period of history. Science has emptied its cornucopia upon mankind. Distance and time are barriers which have given way to the advance of science. There is now not the slightest reason why any person should go cold or hungry or lack any of the amenities of life. What could be more simple than that we should utilise the machine in order to give us all we need of the very best life has to offer? The only thing in the way is the private ownership of the machine.

Here, then, lies the cause of the trouble, and this should be the burden of the workers' complaint.

What we have to do is to obtain ownership and control by the community of the means of production and distribution. Then, and then only, will poverty, ordinary when in work and extraordinary when out of work, be abolished. When the workers establish Socialism every new invention and machine will be used as a greater means to increased comfort and leisure. Leisure in which to become cultured men and women, happy and free. Mrs. O.

A GERMAN "LABOUR" LEADER CARRIES ON THE GOOD WORK OF CAPITALISM

The following report, taken from the French paper, "L'Oeuvre," is worth reproducing in its entirety:—

Berlin, December 6th. The Engineer, Gottfried Feder, author of the famous 25 point programme of the National Socialist (Nazi) Party, who had been appointed Secretary of State and Commissioner for Colonisation, has been deprived of his position by the Leader, Chancellor Adolf Hitler.

It was Gottfried Feder who formulated the great National Socialist slogan, "Down with the bondage to Interest." For more than ten years he has been known as the great economist of the party, and published a series of booklets, approved by the Leader, dealing with the various points of the famous programme of 1925.

This forced retirement has, without any doubt, been taken upon the initiative of Dr. Schacht, who insisted upon this gesture being made, although for nearly a year now the personality of Herr Feder has not had the slightest political importance.

Doubtless Dr. Schacht, who took the stand for international capitalism in his broadcast speech yesterday, sees in the departure of Gottfried Feder an act of symbolical importance. He wished to show that the National Socialism which Adolf Hitler used in order to realise his ascension to power, is definitely finished with. Dr. Schacht, the definite and energetic representative of capitalism, has now won the victory over National Socialism.—Havas News Agency.

The above is another example of what happens when a Labour or so-called Socialist Party attempts to carry on capitalism. It also demonstrates the futility of relying upon leaders.

SHEFFIELD

A MEETING

will be held on Monday, February 25th, 1935

at Room 2,

A.E.U. INSTITUTE, STANLEY STREET

Subject:

"SOCIALISM AND THE BALLOT BOX."

Speaker—E. BODEN

Commence 7.30 p.m.

Questions and Discussion.

Marx on Force

"Force is the mid-wife of progress!" How completely this expression is misunderstood by many who use it! What Socialist Party speaker has not been confronted at some time or other by a callow youth or a bewhiskered old fogey who has either indignantly demanded to know why the S.P.G.B. has thrown the teaching of Marx overboard, or has condescendingly, not to say pityingly, "explained" that nothing can be done through Parliament. To most of our critics, "force" means almost anything but action for the capture and control of the State machine. It may mean the "general strike" or, as Daniel de Leon preferred to call it, the "general lock-out of the capitalist class." It may mean the blind, spontaneous upheaval of an unorganised mass or the deliberate insurrection of an armed minority. It may mean a combination of all these reactions to capitalist pressure; but nowhere does Marx indicate that it is to action on these lines that we must look for deliverance from our fetters.

Let us take a glance at the context of the pregnant phrase as Marx uses it. It occurs in the fifth paragraph of Chap. 31 of "Capital" (p. 776, Swan Sonnenschein edition), which reads as follows:—

The different momenta of primitive accumulation distribute themselves now, more or less in chronological order, particularly over Spain, Portugal, Holland, France, and England. In England, at the end of the 17th century, they arrive at a systematical combination embracing the colonies, the national debt, the modern mode of taxation, and the protectionist system. These methods depend in part upon brute force, e.g., the colonial system; but they all employ the power of the State, the concentrated and organised force of society, to hasten, hot-house fashion, the process of transformation of the feudal mode of production into the capitalist mode, and to shorten the transition. Force is the midwife of every old society pregnant with a new one. It is itself an economic power.

The chapter is entitled "The genesis of the industrial capitalist," and is packed with examples of how the State, in the hands of the capitalist class, wiped out the old classes of feudal society at home (including the peasants and handicraftsmen) and also destroyed the social organisation of more

primitive peoples in other parts of the world, in the quest for markets, raw materials and labour power. This was done partly by military and partly by economic measures; for the State, being "the concentrated and organised force of society," can use either, as the need arises. It is itself an economic power, appropriating and expropriating by taxation, direct and otherwise, the incomes and means of livelihood of the small property owners whose existence stands in the way of capitalist development. At the same time it converts itself into a channel of investment by the huge loans it floats. The holder of State-bonds escapes the risks accompanying the various non-State forms of commercial, industrial or financial enterprise.

There need, therefore, be no confusion as to what Marx and Engels meant when they wrote of "the forcible overthrow of all existing social conditions" at the end of the "Communist Manifesto."

The authors state that, "The proletariat will use its political supremacy to wrest, by degrees, all capital from the bourgeoisie, to centralise all instruments of production in the hands of the State, i.e., of the proletariat organised as the ruling class."

The State, in the eyes of Marx and Engels, is the supreme expression of force in society. In the hands of the master-class it checkmates every move on the part of the workers which might endanger the property rights of the masters. Let some of the workers seize what few arms they can and it meets their puny force with greater force. Let them indulge in a widespread strike, whether of the stop-in or the stay-out variety, and it mobilises this same force to ensure to the capitalist class the control of the food supplies and essential services.

Throughout the struggle between the workers and their masters the control of the State power decides upon which side victory lies. The capture of this power by the workers, consciously organised as a class for the purpose, is the essential first step towards their emancipation. To choose any other line is, in the words of Marx to the First International at the Hague, in 1872, "To renounce the things of this world."

E. B.

Notes by the Way

The "Labour" Pot and the "National Labour" Kettle.

The Prime Minister, Mr. J. R. MacDonald, wrote a letter recently, reaffirming his belief in something he calls "Socialism," but which he explained in his muddled way to be the same thing as true Conservatism. Mr. Herbert Morrison is very indignant about this. He says (see *Manchester Guardian*, January 11th) that MacDonald "with typical woolly-headedness . . . was careful to confuse

those Conservative minds as to what Socialism meant."

Mr. Herbert Morrison is the gentleman who was responsible for the London Passenger Transport Board, which he pretends is a form of "Socialisation." Mr. Morrison and Mr. MacDonald seem to have learned their woolly-headedness in the same school—the I.L.P. fountain-head of a vast amount of the confusion now found in the ranks of the workers.

Palestine and the Nazis

While many Jewish organisations have tried to organise an Anti-Nazi boycott as a demonstration of protest against the persecution of Jews in Germany, it is noteworthy that Palestine, the Jewish Fatherland, has not joined in. The reason is, of course, the usual one, the capitalist need for markets. A large part of the Palestine export of oranges is to Germany, and there you are.

The following extracts are from a letter to the *Jewish Chronicle*, written by a Mr. H. A. Goldner:—

Sir,—While it is to be regretted that Palestine Jewry cannot fully support the world anti-Nazi boycott, and the remarks that have appeared in *The Jewish Chronicle* from time to time during the progress of the negotiations for the German-Palestine Orange Exchange Agreement are to that extent justified, you have nevertheless entirely overlooked the other side of the question. . . .

The question resolves itself into this. Rightly or wrongly, the economic structure of the Jewish Yishuv in Palestine has been built to a very large extent on the basis of citriculture. Last season's total citrus exports from Palestine amounted to roughly 5½ million boxes, of which it is estimated that between 50 per cent. and 60 per cent. were from Jewish groves. It is therefore plain that any collapse in the market value of the fruit would have wide repercussions upon the entire Zionist economic structure. . . .

It was therefore incumbent on the organised representatives of the Jaffa Citrus Industry to take all possible measures to ensure that a reasonable proportion of the fruit could be shipped to Germany, in order to avoid the feared loss of revenue which might have accrued in the United Kingdom markets by swamping them, and which, as I have mentioned above, would have affected the whole Yishuv.

Whether it is important that the boycott should be maintained even at the expense of Palestine, and Palestine sacrificed for the sake of solidarity on this question, is a matter that I leave the theorists to fight out. To me it seems that surely here is a case where "it is better to bear those ills we have than fly to others that we wot not of."

I am, &c.,

H. A. GOLDNER.

63, High Holborn.

* * *

Valuable Smoke

When the various schools of currency mystery-mongers attribute to the banks the miraculous power of creating untold wealth out of nothing, "merely by a few strokes of the pen," they always refuse to tell us why the banks do not use their supposed power. The total profit of the 31 banks of Great Britain and Ireland in 1933 was a mere £13-millions on a paid-up capital of £98-millions. (See *Statist*, May 19th, 1934, p. 792.) Two non-banking companies, the Imperial Tobacco Co. and the British-American Tobacco Co., Ltd., between them make as much profit as the whole of the 31 banks, and on a somewhat smaller capital. Woolworths and Imperial Chemicals each make a far larger profit than the most profitable bank.

Why U.S.A. Entered the World War.

From a despatch sent home by the American Ambassador in London, Mr. Page, in March, 1917. The extract below is given by the Washington correspondent of the *Daily Telegraph*:—

Mr. Page said: "I am sure that the pressure of this approaching crisis has gone beyond the ability of the Morgan financial agency."

"It is not improbable that the only way of maintaining our present pre-eminent trade position, and averting panic, is by declaring war on Germany."

The *Daily Telegraph* correspondent goes on as follows:—

This crisis, the *New York Evening Telegram* declares, was the inability of Britain to meet obligations to J. P. Morgan & Co. exceeding £80,000,000, which had been used to purchase war material manufactured in the United States.

Mr. Page's cable was dated March, 1917, and a month later President Wilson advised Congress to aid the Allies against the Central Powers.

(*Daily Telegraph*, December 15th, 1934.)

These and other disclosures were made at the Senate Commission investigating the sale and manufacture of munitions. One interesting detail was that the Du Pont powder plants in Tennessee made a profit of 39,231 per cent.

HACKNEY

Lectures at Old Gravel Pit Hall, Vallette Street, at 8.30 p.m., on Friday evenings.

February 1st	- - -	Meeting of Hackney Members
" 8th	- - -	Combined Meeting of East London Branches
" 15th	- - -	" President Lincoln "
		A. REGINALD.
" 22nd	- - -	" The Scientific Method "
		E. WILMOT.

WOOD GREEN

Lectures to be held at Stirling House, Stuart Crescent, Wood Green, N. 22, at 8 p.m.

February 13th	- - -	" Economic Freedom—the Road to Power "
		GOLDSTEIN.
" 27th	- - -	" Politics—the Science of Government "
		DOWNTON.

WALTHAMSTOW

Lectures are given each Sunday at 8 p.m. at The Workman's Hall, High Street, E.17.

February 3rd	- - -	" Political Lessons from the Saar "
		C. LESTOR.
" 10th	- - -	" Evolution of Socialist Thought "
		S. STEWART.
" 17th	- - -	" Lessons from the German Tragedy "
		A. KOHN.
" 24th	- - -	" Reform or Social Revolution? "
		T. ALLEN.

LEYTON

Lectures at Trades Hall, Grove House, High Road, Leyton, on Thursday evenings, at 8 p.m.

February 7th	- - -	" Class Struggles "
		ISBITSKY.
" 21st	- - -	" The Science of Revolution "
		D. GOLDBERG.

Open Air Meetings

Sundays:

		Feb. 3rd	10th	17th	24th
Regents Park	11.30 a.m.	Goldberg.	Isbitsky.	Godfrey.	Rubin.
Clapham Common	3 p.m.	Banks.	Walker.	Ross.	Banks.
Avenue Road, Clock Tower, Lewisham	7.30 p.m.	Wilmot.	Isbitsky.	J. Cameron	Reginald.

Mondays:

Ridley Road, Dalston, E.8 8 p.m.

Tuesdays:

Clissold Corner, Albion Road, N.16 8 p.m.

Wednesdays:

Windsor Road, Forest Gate, E. 8 p.m.

Thursdays:

Ridley Road, Dalston, E.8. 8 p.m. "Salmon and Ball," Bethnal Green, E. 8 p.m.

Saturdays:

Avenue Road, Clock Tower, Lewisham 8 p.m.

BRANCH DIRECTORY

BATTERSEA.—Sec., 2, Hanbury Road, S.W.11. Branch meets Thursday, 8.30 p.m., at The Waiting Room, Latchmere Baths, entrance in Burns Road.

BIRKENHEAD.—Communications to H. Dawson, 36, Meadow Street, Birkenhead, Cheshire.

BIRMINGHAM.—Sec., E. Jesper, 38, Rollason Road, Erdington. Branch meets Jeans Café, Newton Street. First Wednesday in month at 8 p.m.

BLOOMSBURY.—Branch meets every Monday at 7.30 p.m., at A.E.U. Hall, 39 Doughty Street, W.C. (Near Grays Inn, Road.) Sec., Miss B. Foster, 2, Old Gloucester Street, W.C.1.

CENTRAL.—Membership obtained only through the Ex. Committee. Applications to General Sec.

CHISWICK.—(See West London).

DAGENHAM.—Branch meets alternate Mondays (from 4th February, at 8 p.m., Pettits' Farm, Heathway. Sec. H. Berry, 5, Cannington Road, Dagenham, Essex.

ECCLES.—Branch meets 1st and 3rd Mondays in month at Railway Temperance Room, Four Bridges, Wellington Road, 7.30 p.m. Lecture and discussion, 8.45. Non-members invited. Secretary, Mrs. F. LEA, 5, Gaskell Road, Eccles, Lancs.

EDINBURGH.—Communications to Sec., D. Lamond, at 15, Barclay Place.

GLASGOW.—Branch meets 2nd and 4th Mondays in month, 8 p.m., at 98 Naburn Street, Glasgow, C.5. Communications to M. Falconer at above address.

HACKNEY.—Branch meets Friday, 7.30 p.m., at Old Gravel Pit Hall, Vallette Street, E.9. Lecture after each meeting. Communication to Sec., E. Hatwell, 36, Haggerston Road, Dalston, E.8.

HULL.—Branch meets alternate Wednesdays, at York Room, The Metropole. Communications to Sec., at 62, Ampleforth Grove, Willerby Road.

ILFORD.—Branch meets Mondays at 8 p.m. at 142, Richmond Road. Discussion after Branch business. Communications to Sec., at above address.

ISLINGTON.—All communications to F. W., 92, Wellington Road, Holloway, N.2. Branch meets on Fridays at 8 to 10.30 p.m., at Room 4, Co-operative Hall, 129, Seven Sisters Road, N.

LEYTON.—Communications to Sec., Mrs. E. C. Snell, 17, Theobald Road, E.17. Branch meets Thursday, 8 p.m., at Trades Hall, Grove House, High Road, Leyton.

LEWISHAM.—Branch meets Thursdays, at 8 p.m., at The Anchor Club Room, Lewisham Road. Communications to H. A. Russell, 73, Kimberley Road, Nunhead, S.E.15.

MANCHESTER.—Branch meets fortnightly (Mondays) as from 14 Jan., at Craigwell Restaurant, Peter Street (entrance in South Street). Sec., B. A. Lee, 19, Emery Avenue, Choriton, Manchester.

PADDINGTON.—Branch meeting held on 2nd Friday, and lecture with discussion on 4th Friday in each month, 8 p.m., in the guild room over "Co-op. Stores," 447, Harrow Road, W.10. Literature Sec., W. Veal, 73, Wornington Road, W.10.

ROMFORD.—Branch meets alternate Tuesdays at 8 p.m. commencing February 5th (open to public) at N.U.R. Club, Albert Road. Business followed by Lecture and discussion. Secy. Lindley E. Lock, 327, Rush Green Road, Romford.

SHEFFIELD.—Sec., G. H. Southey, 83, Wallace Road, Sheffield, 3. Branch meets alternate Mondays, 7.30 p.m. at Room 2, A.E.U. Institute, Stanley Street.

SOUTHEND-ON-SEA.—Branch meets 1st and 3rd Wednesday in the month, at 8 p.m. at 6, Hermitage Road, Westcliff. Discussion after branch business. Non-members invited. Communications to Sec. at above address.

SOUTHWARK.—Branch meets Fridays at 8 p.m., 42, Great Dover St., S.E.1. Communications to Sec., at above address.

STEPNEY.—Sec., S. Goldstein, 18, Irene House, Flower & Dene Street, Stepney, E.1. Branch meets on Fridays, at 8 p.m., at Working Lads Institute (nr. Whitechapel Station).

TOOTING.—Sec., W. Mehew, 19, Littleton Street, S.W.18. Branch meets 1st Sunday in the month, at 12 a'clock at "The Springfield Social Club," 590, Garrett Lane, S.W.17 (Opposite Burntwood Lane).

TOTTENHAM.—Branch meets 1st and 3rd Fridays in the month, 7, Bruce Grove, Room 2. Discussion after branch business. Public invited. Communications to C. Godfrey, 49, Napier Road, Tottenham, N.17.

WALTHAMSTOW.—Branch meets every Wednesday at 8 p.m. at the Workman's Hall (Room 2), High Street, E.17. Sec., Clifford Beloe, 168, Northcote Road, Walthamstow, E.17. Lecture and discussion on alternate Wednesdays.

WEST HAM.—Sec., P. Hallard, 22, Colegrave Road, Stratford, E. Branch meets Whitehall School, Parliament Place, Forest Gate, every Thursday at 8 p.m.

WEST LONDON (Chiswick).—Branch meets Fridays, 8 p.m., at Chiswick Club, over 376, High Road, Chiswick, W.4. Communications to Sec., C. Curtis, 52, Parkstead Road, Putney, S.W.15.

WEMBLEY.—Communications to H. G. Holt, 28, Charterhouse Avenue, Wembley, Middlesex. Branch meets every Friday at 8 p.m. in the Elm Hotel Annexe, St. John's Road, off High Road, Wembley.

WOOD GREEN.—Communications to Sec. at 44, Boreham Road, Wood Green, N.22. Branch meets 2nd and 4th Wednesday in month at 8.30 p.m., Stirling House, Stuart Crescent.

THE SOCIALIST STANDARD

The Official Organ of **THE SOCIALIST PARTY** of Great Britain.

No. 365. Vol. 31]

London, March, 1935

[Monthly. Twopence

*In the . . .
rumblings of
war it is . .
forgotten that
the workers .
supply the . .
material, the
man - power,
the victims . .
and the prize*

The Peace Ballot and the League of Nations

The League of Nations Union, formed with the object of spreading information and gaining support for the League of Nations, has come into the news with its Peace Ballot. The ballot is a house-to-house canvass on five questions, drawn up by the Union. The questions are: (1) Should Great Britain remain a member of the League of Nations? (2) Are you in favour of an all-round reduction of armaments by international agreement? (3) Are you in favour of the all-round abolition of national military and naval aircraft by international agreement? (4) Should the manufacture and sale of armaments for private profit be prohibited by international agreement? (5) Do you consider that if a nation insists on attacking

another the other nations should combine to compel it to stop by (a) economic and non-military measures; (b) if necessary, military measures?

It was to be expected that Lord Beaverbrook and his newspapers would oppose the ballot, as they oppose the League of Nations. They call it the "Ballot of Blood." War, they say, will be avoided only if the British Govern-

ment turns its back on the League, cultivates Empire relationships, and firmly refuses to meddle in the affairs of any country outside the Empire. In their wilder moments, Lord Beaverbrook's papers convey the impression that the League of Nations is itself the cause of war.

At the other extreme are the pacifists, who see the cause of war in the machinations of armament firms, and of mysterious wire-pulling international financiers.

In the middle are the people who vaguely accept the doctrine of the Union, that the avoidance of war only requires the cultivation of peaceful and friendly sentiments, plus the habit of using the international machinery of arbitration and discussion provided by the League of Nations. Where all three groups err is in turning a blind eye on capitalism itself. Let us forget foreign affairs and take a look at capitalism at home. Why are there strikes and lock-outs, unemployed demonstrations, frauds, thefts, swindles, forgeries, adulteration of products, hold-ups, property-murders, and a hundred-and-one other manifestations of conflicts over property and the division of the products of industry? Is it lack of propaganda? On the contrary, we cannot escape the cloying stream of pious sentiments in the Press, over the air, in churches, schools and anywhere else where workers can be compelled to listen. Is it lack of machinery? Not at all. Large Government departments, employers organisations and trade unions, and innumerable voluntary associations work day and night under the shadow of a maze of boards and committees designed to dissuade the capitalist and worker from conflict. The class struggle, in its varied aspects, exists and continues because

ON OTHER PAGES

	Page
Capitalism and Speculation	99
War!	100
The French Revolution	102
The Paris Commune	102
A Monopolist Scheme of Control	104
A Letter from a Former Communist	106
Notes by the Way	107
Christ as a Capitalist	110
Marx and the "Blackcoats"	110
Meetings, Lectures and Discussions -	98, 103, 109, 112

capitalism divides mankind into warring classes, those who live by owning the means of production and distribution, and those who are propertyless and must sell their labour-power to the former. Some people accept this strife as a supposed law of nature. Others preach peace, but steadfastly defend the property basis, which means war. Socialists preach the abolition of the private ownership of the means of life. That is the only way of ending the war of classes.

As it is at home, so it is abroad. Capitalism gives the ruling class the incentive to protect vested interests bound up in trade routes, sources of raw materials, and areas of foreign investment. Control of the machinery of Government gives them the power to wage war. The only sure road to peace is the road which leads to Socialism, conquest of the powers of the Government by a politically organised Socialist majority. While Lords Beaverbrook and Rothermere, and the rest of the capitalist class, own and control the means of life they are the enemies of the working class and a danger to the human race. Their pious oath that they are not interested financially in this or that armament, or aircraft, or any other particular company, is of no significance. They have the supreme vested interest, a vested interest in the maintenance of capitalism. They can be expected, therefore, to sacrifice the interest of society to the interest of themselves and their class.

The Socialist who examines the Union's five questions has no difficulty in seeing their futility. The real position boils down to one question: "Are you in favour of depriving the capitalist class of their control over the machinery of Government, including the armed forces?" "Yes," says the Socialist. "No," says the capitalist and his avowed supporters. "Yes and no, but only gradually, and not unless the capitalist agrees," says the Labourite, with his muddled conceptions of capitalism and Socialism.

It will be seen, therefore, why the Socialist does not share the enthusiasm over the ballot expressed by the League of Nations Union. Nevertheless, even if the mass of the population have a long way to go before they understand the question of war or of the larger question which includes it, the surprisingly large vote for the League of Nations is, in its way, a welcome sign. It is a tribute to the Union's effective canvass, but it also suggests that the average worker is taking a greater interest in affairs that were once the close preserve of the politician, and is breaking away from old ideas about passively accepting war as if it were as inevitable as changes in the weather. The first two million votes gave a 97 per cent. vote in favour of the League, and votes nearly as large for all the first four questions, and for question 5 (a). Question 5 (b), on the use of military measures, shows a smaller majority, 72 per cent.

"for" and 28 per cent. "against." An equally surprising thing is the large number of voters in relation to the total population. In some places well over half the population over the age of eighteen have voted.

One interesting aspect is the efficiency with which the Union has conducted the ballot. By the time it is completed about 250,000 canvassers (mostly voluntary) will have visited 10 million homes and solicited the votes of over 30 million people. That this was possible must be accounted to the large membership and influence the League of Nations Union has acquired. It claims over a million members on its books, about half being paying members, and is well supplied with funds, some of the donations amounting to thousands of pounds. The Union would, no doubt, lose many of its wealthy supporters if the ruling class, after having formed and entered the League of Nations without asking the electorate, should decide to scrap it—also without asking the electorate. H.

EDUCATIONAL COURSE FOR PARTY MEMBERS.

Classes will be held at HEAD OFFICE on Sundays from 4 p.m. to 6 p.m., as follows:—

March 3rd	-	-	-	"Marxian Theory of Value"
" 10th	-	-	-	"Division of Surplus Value"
" 17th	-	-	-	"Money"
" 24th	-	-	-	"Banking"
" 31st	-	-	-	"Crises"

Speakers' Training Class

A Speakers' Training Class intended mainly for those attending Classes is held at Head Office each Sunday from 3 p.m. to 4 p.m., conducted by Comrades Cameron, Lester and Stewart.

To Members and Friends

A SOCIAL

will be held at HEAD OFFICE on

Saturday, 16th March, at 7.30 p.m.

TEA - GAMES - ENTERTAINMENT

"SOCIALISM"

48 pages, price 2d. (Post free 2½d.)

Send for a copy to the LITERATURE SECRETARY,
42 Great Dover Street, S.E.1

"SOCIALISM AND RELIGION"

48 pages. TWOPENCE 2½d. post free.

"The Socialist Party of Great Britain and Questions of the Day"

Deals with the founding of the Socialist Party, the Liberal, Tory, Labour and Communist parties and the I.L.P., the Russian Dictatorship, War, Trade Unions, Social Reforms etc
80 Pages—Price 3d. (Post free—4d.)

Capitalism and Speculation

An attempt by a group of speculators to enrich themselves by cornering two commodities has recently failed. The two commodities are shellac and white pepper; both, it might be mentioned in passing, of importance in connection with the production of war materials. About a year ago the group, through its agents, began to buy up all supplies of these commodities as they came on the market, the object being to force the price up and then to sell at a substantial profit. Shellac and pepper were, presumably, chosen by the speculators for their market manipulations because they thought that the amount of money required to create a corner in these commodities was relatively small, and that supplies could not be rapidly increased. They were mistaken in both respects. As the operations of the group lifted the price of pepper from 8½d. per lb. to 1s. 6d. per lb., and that of shellac from around 70s. per cwt. to 120s. per cwt., larger and larger supplies came on to the market and buyers went round the back of the speculators and obtained their requirements in the native markets. Imports into this country increased enormously, as the following figures show:—

	Shellac.	Pepper.
Imports during 1932	107,705 cwts.	92,873 cwts.
" " 1933	170,044 cwts.	140,873 cwts.
" " 1934	439,517 cwts.	365,922 cwts.

By the end of January stocks of pepper in London amounted to 21,000 tons (four years' supply) as compared with 3,000 tons a year earlier. About 7,000 tons was due to be paid for on February 8th. At the last minute the speculators found themselves not able to command the financial resources they had relied upon. The gamble had failed.

The storm has centred around a Mr. Bishirgian and a firm of metal brokers, James & Shakespeare, of which he is a director. This business was established in 1842 and was converted into a private company in 1917. In September of last year, after the buying of shellac and pepper had begun, the company made a public issue of £300,000 of preference shares and 300,000 ordinary shares of 5s. each. Part of the proceeds of this issue was utilised to acquire the metal and produce departments of G. Bishirgian & Co. and a majority interest in another firm, Williams, Henry & Co. Among the shareholders of James & Shakespeare are Mr. Reginald McKenna, chairman of the Midland Bank, Ltd., who, however, disclaims knowledge of the pepper gamble. Another is Sir Hugo Cunliffe Owen, chairman of the British-American Tobacco Co., Ltd., and the Dean Finance Co., a company of which we shall have more to say later. Purchases of shellac were made by Williams, Henry & Co., while pepper was

bought by James & Shakespeare, both firms acting in the market through brokers. Their dealings, however, were not for their own account, but were on behalf of the group of speculators whose identities are not positively known. It was only because the market confidently believed that there was a powerful group behind the ostensible buyers that dealings were permitted to reach their final unwieldy size. There is now a demand for investigation, but we think it is a safe prophecy that there will be no real inquiry into the gamble and its initiators.

When the bubble burst, all the shellac bought by Williams, Henry & Co., was taken up. Arrangements were made by which the Dean Finance Co., Ltd., took over from James & Shakespeare their holding of shares in Williams, Henry & Co. The Dean Finance Co., Ltd. (director, Sir Hugo Cunliffe Owen) is a subsidiary of Tobacco Investments, Ltd. (directors, Mr. McKenna and Sir Hugo Cunliffe Owen), which in turn is owned by Tobacco Securities Trust (chairman, Mr. McKenna, vice-chairman, Sir Hugo Cunliffe Owen), a subsidiary of British-American Tobacco Co., Ltd. (chairman, Sir Hugo Cunliffe Owen). The managing director of Williams, Henry & Co., Mr. Louis Hardy, resigned. He is on the board of a number of tin companies, which have been connected with the tin restriction scheme, which has the blessing of the Government.

The pepper position, however, could not be propped up, as the shellac was. A winding-up order was applied for against James & Shakespeare. With that company unable to carry out its obligations, the brokers, Rolls & Sons, and J. T. Adair & Co., Ltd., who had acted for it, were also forced to default. Pepper and shellac are now back to their former level of prices. Three firms have smashed. Their employees are out of jobs. The City, in a fit of righteous indignation, is demanding the heads of the real culprits.

This indignation is farcical. There have been many cornering gambles in the past, and there will be more in the future. Capitalism provides scope for gambling of this kind. It offers fortunes to the successful speculator. Its apologists prate of the useful functions performed by the speculator in helping to make a market. When the gamble goes wrong those who get hurt in their pockets always set up howls of indignation. While a system based on the legalised robbery of the workers persists, there will always be struggles over the swag. That is what speculation is, and that is why talk of "cleaning up" capitalism is bluff and pretence. To end speculation it would be necessary to end capitalism.

The fate of the innocent victims, the clerks

now out of jobs, provides a pretty commentary on those who say that profits are payment for risk. The speculators, if they had won, would have made huge profits. The clerks have lost their jobs. What reward did they, or could they, have got for running the risk of unemployment? They suffer when the gamble goes wrong, they would not have gained if it had gone right.

One final point worthy of notice is that we see here a banker, Mr. McKenna, investing money outside banking. Perhaps the illusionists who believe that bankers possess in the banking system a means of creating wealth without limit for themselves will explain why Mr. McKenna should have sought profit in another field.

B. S.

War!

Psychological Causes (?) Aldous Huxley Psychoanalysed!

Aldous Huxley is a writer of some repute, but that he is not of the calibre of his illustrious ancestor is shown by some of the material which he occasionally publishes. One of his latest efforts appears in *The Listener*, under the title of "Sadist Satisfactions in War," and a more illogical lot of nonsense it is difficult to conceive of.

He starts by saying that out of a mistaken idea to simplify things, it is now fashionable to state that the causes of war are economic. We were unaware that it was "fashionable," but let that pass. He gives as the causes of war: "psychological causes," geography and climate, differences in race, language, and culture, the intellectual gifts, passions, and subconscious tendencies of great men, and, finally, and presumably least important, the economic causes of war.

"Strictly speaking," we are told, "all the causes of war are psychological." Mr. Bertrand Russell is quoted as having passed judgment in his latest book on the dispute between psychologists and economists in a single sentence, to wit: "It is true that the conflicts between nations are largely economic, but the grouping of the world by nations is itself determined by causes which are in the main not economic"—"causes," adds Aldous, "which are largely psychological." A careful reading of the quotation from Bertrand Russell gives one the impression that he is of the opinion that the causes of war are mainly economic, so that although Bertrand Russell is quoted in support of Aldous Huxley, it would seem that he is of a different opinion.

"Wars," he goes on to say, "are not fought by climates or systems, but by human beings" (Really!), "and wherever there are human beings, the question of psychology inevitably arises." No sane person would take the affirmative of the denied proposition, but it is evident from the last part of this sentence and other matter in the article, that Aldous is of the opinion that the mental states of a people taking part in a war are the cause of that war. Yet the majority of pictures of mental states which are given are those which have arisen once the

war has started and cannot, therefore, be described as the causes of war.

There is, however, one paragraph which deals with the mental states preceding a war. Let it be quoted:—

So far from discouraging nationalistic hatred and vanity, all governments directly or indirectly foment them. At school, children are taught to boast about their own nation and look down on all other nations. In dictatorial countries, this education in jingoistic sentiments is continued by the state throughout adult life. In liberal countries, it is left to the voluntary labours of the Press. Our rulers profess to desire peace, but do their utmost to make their subjects think and feel in such a way that, the moment a crisis arises, they will all acquiesce in or even actively clamour for war.

Why do governments directly or indirectly foment nationalistic hatred and vanity? Aldous Huxley does not give the answer. Yet surely here is the point which does require to be answered if it is honestly desired to get to the roots of the matter. Aldous Huxley has omitted this point. Possibly, had he thought of it, we might have been told to look for it in the sub-conscious minds of the Government officials! Yet everyone knows that governments exist by virtue of the support of the majority of the people, and under capitalism the different parties gain that support by making various promises to the electorate, and these promises have as their basis the satisfying of certain economic needs on the part of the electorate. The promises are frequently not carried out, but the backing is there. The parties themselves act in the interest of the capitalist class or sections of it—economic self-interest again! Why does a capitalist (Labour in office) Government operate a Poor Law Means Test? Why does a National Government decrease and then increase the unemployment benefit? The answer to both is "to enable capitalism to function." Again, economic interest. And why wars? The Marxian analysis of capitalist society explains the conflict of interests which causes capitalist wars. The capitalists use the State power to capture markets and sources of raw materials, to protect trade routes and areas in which they have invested their surplus wealth—the motive all the time is the profit one. It

is so clear and easy to understand as to be almost self-evident.

We will, however, endeavour to deal with a few more of the points in the morass of "psychological causes," in which Aldous Huxley would have us believe.

Perhaps the most farcical of these is the suggestion that, because less suicides are committed in war time, therefore life during war time is more worth living! Continuing, he says (and now prepare to laugh!): "We say, and with our conscious minds, we firmly believe, that war is a catastrophe; but our sub-conscious selves, it is evident, do not agree with our conscious selves!" How the warriors must have loved the mud in the trenches, how they must have enjoyed the sub-conscious delight of falling over rusty barbed wire, half their face being blown away by a bit of shell, or the amputation of a gangrenous leg! According to Aldous, the suicide statistics show that this sort of life is 45 per cent. more worth living than the dull humdrum life of peace! It would be difficult to believe this, were not Aldous Huxley there to assure us that it is so. Aldous Huxley has forgotten one thing, however, namely, that the majority of people who commit suicide do so, not from peregrinational gallivantings in the sub-conscious mind, but simply and solely because life is not darned well worth living. Has Huxley not read in the papers during the recent economic depression how day after day people committed suicide because they would sooner be dead than cold and half-starved? And is it not a fact known to everyone (except Aldous Huxley) that during a war, when capitalist powers need all the labour power at their command in order to wage it to a successful conclusion, jobs are easier to find and that, although destruction is the business of the majority of the people, yet everyone can get jobs and that, therefore, the prime cause of suicides at once disappears?

It should also be borne in mind that the official statistics of suicides during war time are unreliable, because they omit to take into account the suicides of the soldiers at the front. There were hundreds of such cases during the last war, and these were almost invariably reported as "killed in action."

In the same issue of *The Listener* is the report of a broadcast discussion between Captain Ludovici and A. A. Milne. Captain Ludovici, who advocates armaments for "self-protection," states "I am not a militarist. I loathe and detest war, and nobody could have been more wretched at the front than I was." This is probably the feeling of the majority of those who participated in the last quarrel over the wealth stolen from the workers. Yet Aldous Huxley would have us believe that, at least for many individuals, war is a source of "substantial pleasure"!

Aldous Huxley quotes with approval the saying of a psycho-analyst that the battle of Waterloo was

prepared in the nurseries of Corsica. If the Huxley of our generation knew anything about history, he would know that the Napoleonic wars were caused mainly by the lust for markets, the invasion of France by surrounding countries, who saw in French capitalism a menace to their trade, and in the French revolution a menace to their own systems. And that revolution, which enabled the rising bourgeoisie to throw off the yoke of feudalism, was, it need hardly be said, due absolutely to economic causes.

The question may be raised as to whether the mental outlook of psychologists themselves is not determined by economic interests. The psychologists, if they are to get a living, must write books which will have a sufficient sale to enable them to get a living. The new "science" also opens the door to certain professorial appointments. These appointments being under the control of capitalist interests, they must be careful not to say anything which would undermine the capitalist system. Psychology, with its mostly incomprehensible terminology, unduly impresses the bourgeois mind and opens the door to the much-desired El Dorado. The bourgeoisie also, in their desire to find an excuse for the continuance of the present insane system, find natural allies in the psychologists.

Much light entertainment could be provided by giving further quotations from the article under review, but lack of space forbids. It must be added, however, that, in an article purporting to deal with the causes of war, the discussion of a remedy would naturally have first place, though, if war is so satisfactory from a psychological point of view, it would hardly be necessary to worry about its prevention. And the psychologists are not impatient, as the concluding paragraphs of the article, here below quoted, will show:—

The psycho-analysts profess to have explored the unconscious to a greater depth than has been reached by other investigators. Perhaps it is for this reason that they are so pessimistic about the immediate prospects of abolishing war. Dr. Edward Glover, in *War, Sadism, and Pacifism*, asks for fifty years of intensive research into the human mind. Only then, he thinks, shall we know enough to be able to act with any real prospect of getting rid of the tendencies that make for war.

What is to happen in the interval? We must be content, I suppose, to prescribe such political, economic, and psychological sedatives as shall prevent the patient from going completely out of his mind and committing suicide. If we can keep him alive long enough, the doctors may at last agree on the diagnosis and discover a cure.

If the workers are going to rely upon the psychologists to bring about a mental state unproductive of war, they will evidently have to wait a long time!

If our contention is correct, however, that is to say, that wars naturally arise from the existing form of society, then it is evident that only by a revolutionary change in the structure of society can they be eliminated.

RAMO.

The French Revolution

(Lecture by Com. STEWART, November 18th, 1934.)

1. ANTECEDENTS.

(a) Ideological.

1. Traditional Classicism (of use of Bible during English Revolution).
2. English Materialism. 1600, Bacon. 1650, Hobbes, 1670, Locke.
3. French Encyclopædists. "Reasoned System of All Human Knowledge," *Diderot*. Social-historical viewpoint. Complete scepticism.
4. Iconoclasts. *Voltaire*, Brilliantly narrow, Super-reformer, Deist.
5. Emotional Individualism. *Rousseau*, Golden-Age idea. Extremely popular.
6. Communism. *Meslier, Morelly, Mably*. "All evil due to private property. No need for exchange." Atheists. Not popular. Influenced Babeuf.

(b) Factual.

1. *In France*. Normal development of capitalism checked after Renaissance by strong absolute monarchy. After Louis XIV decay of absolutism. No constitution. Extreme class-contrast. 1780 conditions ripe for machinofacture but outworn political system shackled production.
2. *Outside France*. (1) English Revolution, 1649 and 1689. (2) Contrast between English prosperity and French poverty. Commercial treaty, 1786, intensified this. (3) American Revolution: (a) "No taxation without representation"; (b) War cost France £80,000,000.

2. IMMEDIATE CAUSES.

1783. Severe economic and financial crisis. Bad Harvests, etc.
1789. May 5th: First assembly of States General for 185 years. Third Estate (lawyers, merchants, etc.) militant. Dispute as to voting. June 17th: Secession of Third Estate. Spontaneous anarchy throughout France. Bread riots, etc.

3. COURSE.

(a) *Big Bourgeoisie*, 1789-1792.

National Assembly. Aug. 4th: "St. Bartholomew of property" abolished feudal privilege but NOT property rights. Feudal Lords cap; Landowners. 1790-91: Reforms for traders and industrialists. Civil Constitution of Clergy. 1791. June 14th: *Trade Unions banned* ("contrary to equality").

Constitution: Property and money qualification for franchise. "Rights of Man"; Liberty, Security, Property.

(b) *Petty Bourgeoisie*, 1792-1794.

Legislative Assembly. Girondin-Jacobin rule. Counter-revolution. 1792, April: War—Austria, Prussia, Russia, then England. August: Fall of monarchy. Sept.: Massacres; victories. *Convention* elected on much wider suffrage. *REPUBLIC*.

1. Girondins. Resisted further attacks on property. Fell.
2. Jacobins. Petty-bourgeois reforms, pensions, "work or maintenance," etc., maximum price for necessities, also *maximum wage*.
3. Danton's dictatorship. Committee of Public Safety. Terror.
4. Jacobin split: (1) Bourgeois intelligentsia, e.g., Danton; (2) Petty-bourgeoisie, e.g., Robespierre; (3) Small shop-keepers, craftsmen, e.g., Hebert; (4) Nucleus of proletariat, e.g., Rous, Varlet. Centre destroyed others.
5. Robespierre's dictatorship. Religious Utopianism. Then war danger over need for consolidation made his theorising unpopular. Thermidor. July 27th, 1794.

(c) *Bourgeois Republic*.

Return of Girondins. Apathy. "Order." Gains of Revolution to be protected from both reac-

tionaries and levellers. See-saw politics leading to military dictatorship.

1795. Bonaparte quells Royalist rising. (Whiff of grape-shot.)

1796. Babeuf's Conspiracy of the Equals. Demanded entire abolition of private property, but no real understanding. Secret—of Blanqui. Foredoomed because proletariat still only embryonic.

The underlying function of the French Revolution was to enable the powers of industrial development to be utilised to the full. In five years it solidly established a new order of society. It was left to Napoleon merely to consolidate and clarify the results, and to carry them further afield.

READ: Booklet in "Working-class History Course." Pub. Martin Lawrence.

"French Revolution," by Albert Mathiez.

"French Revolution" section of Cambridge

Modern History.

"Last Episode of French Revolution," by E. B. Bax.

"The Gods are Athirst," by Anatole France.

"Revolution, 1789-1906," by R. W. Postgate.

Various references by Marx, particularly in "Holy Family" and eighteenth "Brumaire."

The Paris Commune

(Lecture by Com. LESTER, November 25th, 1934.)

A. PREVIOUS EVENTS IN FRENCH HISTORY.

1789-1800, Great French Revolution liberated forces of capitalist production. 1800-1815, Napoleonic wars. 1815-1830, Restored Bourbon monarchy; reaction. 1830, July "revolution" set up Orleanist constitutional monarchy. Growing influence of English Chartism. 1848, February "revolution." Second Republic. Louis Napoleon President. 1852, Second Empire. 1854, Crimean War. 1864, First International growth of Trade Unions and Co-operative Societies. Unemployment—National Workshops.

B. IMMEDIATE CAUSES.

Louis Napoleon's position weak; desired prestige through military glory. Germany wanted Alsace-Lorraine. July, 1870, Franco-Prussian war. French army inadequate. Louis Napoleon incompetent in command. Three French defeats. Sept. 2nd, Battle of Sedan. *Surrender of Louis Napoleon*. Sept. 4th, Paris declared a Republic and a "Government of National Defence." Sept. 25th, Paris besieged. Oct. 31st, Fall of Provisional Government. Blanqui in office. Anarchy. Plebiscite. Return of Provisional Government. Arrest of Blanqui. *No defence of Paris*. Starvation. Unrest in National Guard (100,000 men). 1871, Jan. 22nd, Pro-Commune riots in Paris. Jan. 29th, Armistice. Feb. 8th, Elections. Monarchist Assembly returned. Riots. *Thiers, Chief of Executive*. Versailles made the capital. Mar. 13th, All rent and debts to be paid within three days. Mar. 18th, *Thiers' attempted seizure of National Guards' cannon*. Fraternisation with troops. Spontaneous popular insurrection. *Flight of Government*. Central Committee of National Guard found itself the sole authority in Paris. Mar. 26th, Paris elections. Victory of advanced party. Mar. 28th, Proclamation of the *Commune*. Membership unco-ordinated—Fenians, Blanquists, Internationalists, Republicans, veterans of 1848. No communication with provinces. Provincial Communes short-lived. No manifesto or programme.

C. THE COMMUNE.

1. Legislation.

Post Office, Hospitals, Museums reorganised. Maximum Government Salary, £240. Rent degree repealed; all rents from Oct., 1870, to July, 1871, waived. Pawnshops suppressed, pawned goods returned. Church and State separated. But: Departments of Police, Justice and War chaotic. *Careful of property*. No plan. No constructive programme in education.

Department of Labour and Exchange: Forbade night-work for bakers (decree ignored) and fines or stoppages of wages. Factories not in use to be confiscated and run by workers' syndicates. But *compensation agreed*. Though defective in detail, declared for emancipation of worker and expropriation of exploiter. Ineffective. *Commune failed to seize Bank of France*.

2. History.

April 2nd, Thiers bombarded Paris. Commune inexperienced in warfare: National Guard disorganised. *Collusion between Thiers and Bismarck, though France and Prussia still at war*. Commune wrongly expected support of enemy rank and file. Vacillation. Incompetence. Delay. April 19th, Programme: "Communal Autonomy"—impractical, unwanted. Factions within Commune Government. Line of fire closing in on Paris. May 21st, Thiers entered Paris. Barricades. Anarchy. Members of Commune dispersed. May 21st-27th, Street fighting. Heroism—devotion—but no method, no organisation, lack of ammunition. Piecemeal annihilation. May 27th-June 2nd, *The Week of Blood*. At least 20,000, probably 40,000, massacred.

The Commune was important as the first attempt of workers to seize power and organise society. *Foredoomed* because it attempted to force the pace of history; not based on understanding; an unprepared, unthinking movement; the work of a well-meaning but confused minority.

BOOKS TO READ.

E. B. Bax: Short History of the Paris Commune.
Postgate: Revolution (Commune section).
Kautsky: Terrorism and Communism (Commune section).
G. L. Dickinson: Revolution and Reaction in Modern France (Commune section).
Lissagary: History of the Commune.
Marx: Civil War in France.

MEETINGS AND LECTURES

All of the lectures announced here are open to non-members. Admission free. Questions and discussion are welcomed.

SUNDAY MEETINGS AT HEAD OFFICE

Lectures are given every Sunday evening at Head Office, 42 Great Dover Street, S.E.1, at 8.30 p.m.

March 3rd	-	-	-	"Socialism and Unemployment"	COM. BELLINGHAM
"10th	-	-	-	"The Tragedy of Trotsky and Zinoviev"	COM. A. KOHN
"17th	-	-	-	"The International Situation"	COM. LESTER
"24th	-	-	-	"Science and Revolution"	COM. E. LAKE
"31st	-	-	-	"The Use of Parliament"	COM. E. HARDY

BLOOMSBURY

Lectures will be given on Monday evenings at A.E.U. Hall, 39, Doughty Street (Corner of Guildford Street), W.C.1. at 8.30 p.m.

March 4th	-	-	-	"Classes and Class Struggles"	D. GOLDBERG
"11th	-	-	-	"Political Economy before Marx"	S. GOLDSTEIN
"18th	-	-	-	Open Discussion	
"25th	-	-	-	"Socialism and the Transport Problem"	G. BELLINGHAM

PADDINGTON

A Lecture will be given in the Guild Room, over "Co-op" Stores, 447 Harrow Road, W.10, on Friday, March 22nd, at 8 p.m.

Subject	Speaker
"The Revolutionary Proposition."	A. Ambridge

WEMBLEY

Friday Evening Lectures at Elm Hotel Annexe, St. John's Road, Wembley, at 8.0 p.m.

March 8th	-	-	-	"Women: Past, Present and Future"	S. STEWART.
"22nd	-	-	-	"Dictatorship or Democracy"	E. HARDY

WOOD GREEN

Lectures at Stirling House, 4 Stuart Crescent (behind War Memorial), Wood Green, at 8 p.m., Wednesday.

March 13th	-	-	-	"Why the S.P.G.B. must oppose all other Political Parties"	AMBRIDGE
March 27th	-	-	-	"The Socialist Attitude towards Russia"	ISBITSKY.

LEYTON

Lectures given Sunday evenings, at Workman's Hall, Room 3, 82 High Street, Walthamstow, E.17, at 8 p.m.

March 3rd	-	-	-	"Reforms or Social Revolution"	T. ALLEN.
"10th	-	-	-	"What is Socialism?"	A. JACOBS
"17th	-	-	-	"Socialist Attitude towards Russia"	ISBITSKY
"24th	-	-	-	"Machinery and Unemployment"	E. HARDY
"31st	-	-	-	"Some Sidelights on Capitalism"	E. WILMOT

HACKNEY

Lectures at Old Gravel Pit Hall, Vallette Street, at 8.30 p.m., on Friday evenings.

March 1st	-	-	-	"The Class Struggle"	J. KRIEFMAN
"8th	-	-	-	"Education"	R. REGINALD
"15th	-	-	-	"Socialism in our Time"	D. GOLDBERG
"22nd	-	-	-	"The Road to Working Class Victory"	D. ROSS
"29th	-	-	-	"The Need of Today"	R. INNES

THE SOCIALIST STANDARD

MARCH,



1935

OFFICIAL NOTICE

All communications for the Executive Committee. Subscriptions for the SOCIALIST STANDARD, Articles, and Correspondence submitted for insertion therein, should be addressed—The Socialist Party of Great Britain, 42, Great Dover Street, London, S.E.1, to whom Money Orders should be made payable.

The meetings of the Executive Committee are held at the Head Office, every Tuesday, at 7.30 p.m.

TERMS OF SUBSCRIPTIONS.

Twelve Months, post free	2s. 6d.
Six Months, post free	1s. 3d.

A Monopolist Scheme for Control

Since the advocates of "nationalisation" of industry switched over to preaching State supervision of private monopolies on the lines of the London Passenger Transport Board there has been a noticeable increase of friendliness in the relationship between leading trade union officials and Labour leaders on the one side and what are called "progressively minded" captains of industry on the other. The progressive mindedness means nothing more than that the individuals in question have an interest in replacing the existing small and medium-sized concerns by large-scale monopolies or semi-monopolies. That they are in favour of change at all is sufficient to bring the Labour Party to view them as potential allies on the road to office, and that party obligingly popularises the terms "Public ownership," "public utility corporation," and "socialisation" as a cover under which those large-scale capitalists who are out to devour their smaller and weaker brethren, can operate. The Labour Party and the trade unions are thus to throw their weight on the side of the workers' most powerful enemies, or are to remain neutral while these enemies consolidate their position.

The lines on which the bigger capitalists are thinking has already been disclosed by the merger of London transport and the schemes propounded in various quarters for amalgamating the iron and steel industry, the mines, the electricity concerns, and so on. A detailed scheme applicable to a whole series of industries is contained in the Industrial Reorganisation (Enabling)

Bill), presented in the House of Lords last autumn by Lord Melchett (price 4d., from H.M. Stationery Office).

Some interest attaches to the promoter of the Bill. He is the son of the late Lord Melchett, formerly Sir Alfred Mond, the Liberal who went over to the Conservatives at about the time that the Conservatives' Derating Act bestowed very substantial rating reliefs on Imperial Chemical Industries, the firm of which he was head. The present Lord Melchett is director of I.C.I. and of other chemical, coal, and finance companies, and of Barclays Bank. Although a Conservative, he holds what are regarded as unorthodox views on currency and banking, and like his father, has been heard to denounce the rapacity of the money-lending capitalists. Because of this he is much admired in certain Labour and currency crank circles where the sectional antagonisms of the various groups of capitalists are thought to be of concern to the workers who are exploited indiscriminately by all capitalists. One can guess that Lord Melchett would show the same lofty disregard of the party line as did his father, and he may some day be seen graciously allowing the Labour Party enthusiasts for remodelling capitalism to pull chestnuts out of the fire for him.

The Big Fish devour the Little Ones.

The object of the bill "is to provide for the self-government of industries by enabling the majority of producers in an industry, notwithstanding the opposition of a small minority, to introduce and cause to be enforced schemes for the reorganisation of the whole or part of that industry with the general object of promoting greater efficiency, eliminating wasteful competition, and of facilitating the production, manufacture, and supply of the products of that industry."

Now what could be more reasonable, innocent-sounding, and democratic than that? Who would not want to see mining, chemicals, textiles, tobacco, foodstuffs, etc., etc., made more efficient in the interest of all?

But not so fast. The voting is to be "democratic," the "majority" is to decide the issue (subject to inquiry, supervision, and possible veto by Government and Parliament), but the majority is not to be a majority of the population or of those engaged in the industry. It is only to be a majority of persons who have "an ownership interest," in other words, the capitalists alone, although they are only a small minority in relation to the workers they employ. Thus this democratic self-regulation of industry is just the same as the so-called democratic control of industry preached by Sir Oswald Mosley and the Fascists generally. The workers are to get a look-in not in proportion

to their numbers, but simply as a trade union having a "special interest" in the industry, and thus entitled merely to express opinions. Lord Melchett, like Sir Oswald Mosley, is determined that the workers shall not decide. Capitalism, reorganised, is to be preserved intact.

Moreover—and this is where the bill exposes the particular aim of the big capitalist—the "ownership interest" of any person or persons putting forward a scheme of reorganisation to the Board of Trade must be a "substantial one having regard to the ownership of all other persons having an ownership interest in the industry." Thus weight is to be given in the question of promoting a scheme, not to the number of capitalists, but to the size of their capital. Eventually, after any scheme has been published and discussed, a poll of all persons having an ownership interest shall take place, and if 75 per cent. of the recorded votes are in favour the scheme shall go forward for Parliamentary approval notwithstanding the objections of the minority. The use of this to crush the smaller fry in any industry is obvious, and that no doubt is why Lord Melchett's bill was drafted. Those of his admirers who think that his criticisms of the banks arise from a disinterested desire to see the small man helped to keep his head above water by means of easier credit facilities are invited to study the bill, and note what its effects would be if it or a similar measure is eventually adopted by a Government and becomes law.

Anyone who is interested in the way large-scale industry is developing will find much useful material in a study of Imperial Chemical Industries, published in the *Economist* (January 19th, 1935). This £77 million combine made £7,664,000 profit in 1933.

What this means is perhaps best conveyed by relating it to the number of workers unemployed. According to figures published a few years ago, the number was then about 60,000, and on this basis the profit represents about £128 per head of the workers employed. (The number has, possibly, increased somewhat in the meantime.)

I.C.I. is interested in chemicals, explosives, fertilisers and many other trades, "as diversified as sporting cartridges and soda crystals, motor components and motor fuel, plastics and property ownership." It has connections by shareholdings or agreements with powerful concerns in Germany, U.S.A., Canada, S. Africa, and elsewhere. It has a "footing in many countries (from China, literally, to Peru)."

In view of the popularity so-called planned economy is attaining in the eyes of members of the Labour Party, we read with interest the opinion expressed by the *Economist* that:

the modern world indeed, under a régime of private enterprise, has

produced no more perfect an example of "planned economy," centralised for policy and finance, decentralised in administrative functions, and aimed at all points in its relations with suppliers, customers, competitors and the State.

THE SOCIALIST PARTY OF GREAT BRITAIN

OBJECT. The establishment of a system of society based upon the common ownership and democratic control of the means and instruments for producing and distributing wealth by and in the interest of the whole community.

DECLARATION OF PRINCIPLES

THE SOCIALIST PARTY of Great Britain HOLDS—

1. That society as at present constituted is based upon the ownership of the means of living (i.e., land, factories, railways, etc.) by the capitalist or master class, and the consequent enslavement of the working class, by whose labour alone wealth is produced.

2. That in society, therefore, there is an antagonism of interests, manifesting itself as a class struggle, between those who possess but do not produce, and those who produce but do not possess.

3. That this antagonism can be abolished only by the emancipation of the working class from the domination of the master class, by the conversion into the common property of society of the means of production and distribution, and their democratic control by the whole people.

4. That as in the order of social evolution the working class is the last class to achieve its freedom, the emancipation of the working class will involve the emancipation of all mankind without distinction of race or sex.

5. That this emancipation must be the work of the working class itself.

6. That as the machinery of government, including the armed forces of the nation, exists only to conserve the monopoly by the capitalist class of the wealth taken from the workers, the working class must organise consciously and politically for the conquest of the powers of government, national and local, in order that this machinery, including these forces, may be converted from an instrument of oppression into the agent of emancipation and the overthrow of privilege, aristocratic and plutocratic.

7. That as all political parties are but the expression of class interests, and as the interest of the working class is diametrically opposed to the interests of all sections of the master class, the party seeking working-class emancipation must be hostile to every other party.

8. THE SOCIALIST PARTY of Great Britain, therefore, enters the field of political action determined to wage war against all other political parties, whether alleged labour or avowedly capitalist, and calls upon the members of the working class of this country to muster under its banner to the end that a speedy termination may be wrought to the system which deprives them of the fruits of their labour, and that poverty may give place to comfort, privilege to equality, and slavery to freedom.

Those agreeing with the above principles and desiring enrolment in the Party should apply for membership form to secretary of nearest branch or at Head Office.

A Letter from a Former Communist

[We have received the following letter from a former Communist. It is particularly interesting, as the writer took an active part, in the Manchester area, in the work of the Communist Party. While we may not see eye-to-eye with the writer on every point, his letter merits serious attention, as an example of the outlook to which years of whole-hearted support of the Communist Party has brought one of its adherents.—ED. COMM.]

Stockport.

February 20th, 1935.

The Editorial Committee,

THE SOCIALIST STANDARD.

Dear Comrades,

Although in the past I have been an active and enthusiastic member of the Communist Party, the recent change of policy in relation to the Labour Party has compelled me to re-examine the principles and policy of the Party I formerly supported. The conclusions, for what they are worth—but by no means lightly arrived at—are set out below.

At the moment, the C.P., notwithstanding all specious reservations, is committed in principle to the return of a third Labour Government as a "lesser evil" to the National Government of to-day. This in spite of past vehement declarations that Labourism was Social Fascism, was, as Stalin declared, "objectively the moderate wing of Fascism." I, at least, have learned the lesson that the Labour Party "is the most dangerous enemy of the working-class within the working-class" too well; so well, in fact, that I find it impossible to support one capitalist party against another in the supposed interests of unity—even though the Party I am asked to support calls itself Labour.

The incontestable truth is that the change from unqualified opposition to the Labour Party and I.L.P. (quite clearly defined in the C.C. Resolution of the C.P.G.B., 1931) to one of support, was imposed from above by the Comintern when, after the German disaster and at a moment's notice, it issued its world-wide appeal to its component parties to make unity overtures to organisations hitherto denounced as "Social-Fascist," etc. Evidently, one policy having proved so disastrous, it was decided, with a complete lack of political principle, to try something else.

The indecent haste employed by representatives of the Soviet Union in attempting to conclude pacts of an economic and political character with the butchers of the German working-class; the entrance of the Soviet Union into that "thieves' kitchen," the League of Nations; the substitution of the "defence of the Soviet Union" for the world revolution, can only mean that the Comintern has become completely subordinated to the special

interests of the Soviet Union; and that, consequently, the various Communist Parties have been degraded to mere advertising agencies for Russia.

The advent to power in Germany of the Hitler dictatorship proves quite conclusively the bankruptcy of Communist policy. Through their blind "fetishism" of violence, the German Communists contributed just as much to the dissipation of the working-class forces as did the Social-Democrats through their shameless prostitution of the name of Socialism. Palme Dutt, in his book, "Fascism and the Social Revolution," quotes, in support of his case, Kautsky, who, in his introduction to the third edition of his book, "The Proletarian Revolution" (1931), says: "In November, 1918, the Revolution was the work of the proletariat alone. The proletariat won so all-powerful a position that the bourgeois elements at first did not dare to attempt any resistance." What lesson is drawn from this? That the German Social-Democrats betrayed the revolution because they persuaded the German working-class to adopt the "peaceful path to Socialism," as against the path of violent revolution advocated by the Communists.

The one clear and indisputable conclusion, namely, that Social-Democracy was able to operate a policy of capitalism, suitably garbed in "Socialist" phrases, because the majority of the German working-class were in complete ignorance of Socialist principles, has so far been completely ignored by Communist writers on German events.

Before the workers can obtain political power, and wield it in their own interests, they must be conscious of those interests. The Communist Party, in urging the workers to fight for reforms, has not assisted in any way in aiding the workers to realise the need for Socialism. In fact, the thousands that have drifted in and out of the C.P. proves that they have failed to educate their own members in Socialist principles, to say nothing of the working-class.

For a so-called revolutionary party to enter into competition with reformist parties for reforms, is utterly futile. Any reforms that capitalism may think necessary will reach the working-class via parties with years of experience, organisation and traditions in the reformist business.

If the emancipation of the working-class is to be the work of the working-class itself, it follows with iron logic that the working-class must know from what it has to emancipate, and to what its emancipation will lead. This can only be achieved by spreading Socialistic knowledge.

Therefore, I appeal to all thinking members of the Communist Party to earnestly consider whether their time could not be more profitably employed

in working for a Party that stands uncompromisingly for Socialism, instead of in a Party where half their time has to be occupied in explaining away the political somersaults of the Communist leadership, and the other half in urging

workers to fight for reforms, which, even if granted, leave the position of the working-class materially unaltered.

Yours fraternally,

A. H. MAERTENS.

Notes by the Way

Democracy in Russia.

After decrying Parliament and democracy and practising dictatorship and suppression for 17 years, the Russian Government has had to respond to the pressure of discontent and economic forces and begin to relax the system which it claimed was the best of all possible systems and the only method of achieving Socialism. The All-Union Congress of Soviets on February 6th decided unanimously in favour of constitutional reforms proposed by the Government (see *Manchester Guardian* and *News-Chronicle*, February 7th, *Daily Herald*, February 2nd, *Daily Worker*, February 4). Among the changes are to be the introduction of the secret ballot in place of voting by show of hands; the abolition of the system of indirect elections, under which the elector, instead of voting for the central assembly direct, voted for candidates to a local soviet, which voted for a regional soviet, and so on up to the centre; equal voting rights for town workers and peasants—in the past the town workers had more representatives than were their due according to their numbers. There is no indication however that political parties will be allowed in opposition to the Government Party.

What is really entertaining is the statement made by M. Molotov that Russia is going to take over "all that was best in the Parliamentary system" (*Manchester Guardian*, February 7th). It is only a few short years since the Communists were 100 per cent. sure that the parliamentary system was rotten to the core, a mere capitalist device, useless to the Socialist movement.

Canadian Premier Embarrasses the Reformers.

Nobody can complain that capitalist politics are dull these days. While the Bolsheviks are going over to a parliamentary system, Mr. Bennett, Conservative Prime Minister of Canada, is raiding the programmes of his Liberal, Labour, and Communist opponents. All the observers agreed that Mr. Bennett would be hopelessly defeated at the next election and that the Liberals would come into power, with the Labourites (the Canadian Co-operative Commonwealth Federation) a likely second. Then suddenly Mr. Bennett proclaimed a "New Deal," stole all the most popular points out of his opponents' programmes, made fierce

attacks on the evils of capitalism, and in short upset all calculations.

Here in a nutshell is the answer to the Labour-Communist argument that the way to establish Socialism is to rally the workers on a reformist programme. The capitalists can always, if they wish, adopt the programme or some of it, and round up the voters.

Now the Canadian Labourites are uneasily wondering what their next move shall be.

In the meantime Mr. Bennett is not doing things by halves. Perceiving that among the electors there is a lot of interest and admiration for certain foreign "left wing" politicians, Mr. Bennett cleverly raids that also by expressing his admiration for the politicians in question. At a dinner at Montreal on January 28th he spoke as follows (*Times*, January 29th, 1935):—

he thought the capitalist system should continue, but if the profit motive which had been its mainspring for centuries was left uncontrolled, conditions would arise disheartening to mankind and ruinous to civilisation.

He agreed that he had held different views in the past, and gave an account of the influences which had helped to convert him. Conversations with M. Litvinoff at Geneva had played their part, he said, and he expressed admiration for Sir Stafford Cripps and Mr. John Strachey, describing Mr. Strachey as "one of the profound thinkers of our times."

Tory "Socialism."

Mr. MacDonald's message to University Conservatives, telling them that their party has always been more or less Socialistic, was obviously designed to make easier his personal position as "Socialist" Prime Minister of a Conservative Government. The effect on old-fashioned Conservatives must have been startling. At once *The Times* gave prominence to a letter from Dr. Hearnshaw protesting that State capitalism, as exemplified in the Post Office and Telegraphs, is not Socialism, but is "for entirely non-Socialistic ends" (*Times*, January 12th), thus rescuing Disraeli, Shaftesbury, and other Conservative leaders from the doubtful honour MacDonald wished to give them. In order to support his plea for clarity Dr. Hearnshaw quoted from the *SOCIALIST STANDARD*, but after seeking accuracy in one direction immediately went on to inaccuracy in another. It suited him on this occasion to oppose a certain misuse of the word Socialism, but he was not concerned with accurately representing the methods advocated by Socialists. So

he proceeded to state that Socialists employ the methods of "general strikes or Bolshevik revolutions" to achieve Socialism.

The principal offenders in the misuse of the word Socialism—apart from the Labour Party and I.L.P., who invariably offend—are the newspapers. Almost all of them do it habitually. Even *The Times*, which is more accurate than some of its cheaper brethren, often writes of the Labourites as Socialists. Curiously enough, side-by-side with Dr. Hearnshaw's letter was one from the British Empire Union calling the London Labour Party the "London Socialist Party."

Some newspapers do it out of simple ignorance and an inveterate inability to be accurate. Others, like Lord Beaverbrook's papers, offend wilfully. Lord Beaverbrook employs tame "left-wingers" as Labour correspondents. Let him ask them whether they think that State action is Socialism, and the Labour Party a Socialist party.

Cardinal Bourne and The Labour Party.

From a *Times* editorial on the death of Cardinal Bourne, head of the Catholic Church in this country:—

When, more than thirty years ago, Dr. Bourne, the youngest of the English Roman Catholic Bishops, was chosen for the metropolitan see of Westminster, the appointment was received by his own communion with surprise and with grave doubts. He seemed to be a contrast to his great predecessors. He had not Wiseman's profound learning, nor did he appear to possess Manning's statesmanship and social enthusiasm or Vaughan's commanding personality. But the Vatican knew their man, and their choice has long been abundantly justified.

Everyone will recall the profound effect produced by the broadcast of the Cardinal's brief and pithy condemnation of the General Strike of seven years ago. But he persistently refused to declare membership of the constitutional, non-revolutionary Labour Party inconsistent with fidelity to the Church.

—(*Times*, January 2nd, 1935.)

But it must not be imagined that the Cardinal was in any way unsympathetic towards the efforts of the humbler classes to ameliorate their lot through legitimate political action. Some of the stiffer Tories among his flock frequently demanded that he should place the Labour Party out of bounds; but his Eminence always replied that Catholics might work and vote for any of the three great political parties so long as those parties remained within the four corners of Christian ethics and that none of them drifted into Socialism of the Marxian school.

—(*Times*, January 1st, 1935.)

The Absurdity of Mixing Socialism and Reforms.

The *Times* asks the Labour Party to explain why it has a long list of reforms, if it really believes that its so-called "Socialist" programme will obviate the need for any of these ameliorative measures. It is a mystery to which no Labourite can ever give a satisfactory answer.

Why the Labour Party should keep in its programme a long list of proposals for ameliorative legislation, to improve industrial and social circumstances, when it claims to possess one grand remedy

for all the economic ills of the community, and to lack only the power to apply it in every department of national life, has been a little puzzling; but it has the practical effect of giving the party a choice of policies to set before the country when a General Election comes.

—(*Times*, January 17th, 1935.)

Communists again Support the Labour Party.

The history of the relations between the Communist Party and the Labour Party (summarised in the *SOCIALIST STANDARD*, October, 1931) has taken a further twist which lands the Communists back where they were 12 years ago. The position at the 1931 General Election was that the Communists nowhere supported Labour candidates, at least if they did it was apparently not on official instructions. Now the Conference of the Communist Party will again require Communists to work for the return of Labour Party candidates, where there is no Communist in the field. This is merely an extension to parliamentary elections of the policy already applied in the recent municipal elections. At South Kilburn and Willesden in October, 1934, two Communist candidates were put forward for the Council elections, and then officially withdrawn, according to a statement of the Communist election agent, "in the interests of unity with the rank and file electors against the Municipal Reform candidates. We shall call on all our supporters to vote for the Labour candidates in these two wards." (*Willesden Chronicle*, October 26th, 1934.)

At St. Pancras, Southwark, Hendon, and apparently all over London and the Provinces there were last-minute withdrawals of some of the Communist candidates in order to help the Labour Party.

There were, however, the usual entertaining developments of Labour candidates publicly repudiating the Communists who were supporting them; for the reason, of course, that Communist support is in many neighbourhoods a sure way of losing votes. At Finsbury the Labour candidate, Mr. F. T. Lynch, issued a repudiation of this kind, and was hard-hearted enough to describe the Communist offer of support as a wrecking manœuvre designed to let the Tory in.

Of course, the Communists hoped to get Labour support for their own candidates, but their two-faced policy availed them nothing, for, according to the *Times* (November 3rd, 1934), all of their 62 candidates in London and all of their 45 candidates in the Provinces were defeated.

It need hardly be said that the Communists everywhere followed their usual practice of soliciting votes on a programme of reforms. In North-West London the Communist Party issued a Manifesto, cadging for votes on the following reformist pleas:—"Extra winter relief," "free boots for the unemployed," "new school buildings," "immediate 25 per cent. reduction in rent of all Council houses," "more playing fields," "work at trade

union rates to provide houses at rents workers can afford to pay," etc., etc.

In the Gorbals District of Glasgow the Communist, Mr. McShane, came out strongly for the very revolutionary demand: "Vote and fight for the de-rating of working class houses."

He also demanded, "immediately," a two-year programme of 20,000 houses for the workers, the "immediate ending of every slum in Glasgow," and the "75 per cent. rate exemption for all workers' houses."

(Why not 100 per cent.?)

Other of his demands were "Soviet Power in Glasgow," more workers and less work on the trams and buses, and no more evictions.

Mr. Arthur Woodburn and Capitalism.

Among the interesting features of the elections was a letter to the *Glasgow Herald* (October 26th, 1934), from a candidate, Mr. Arthur Woodburn (who masquerades as a Marxist), claiming that his party's (i.e., the Labour Party's) schemes for nationalising the banks—

are purely of a business character and can be justified on grounds of efficiency and public policy.

He explained that nationalisation of the banks "does not in any way interfere with the normal functions of assisting industry, except in so far as their services might be supplied cheaper by an elimination of overlapping and waste."

Here speaks the ambitious Labour leader, assuring his future masters that they need fear no attack on capitalism.

The Robin Hood Bank Clerk.

Recently a case came before the Courts of a bank clerk who had transferred money belonging to wealthy clients or to the bank itself to the accounts of poorer depositors. The sum ran into a few thousand pounds, and an unsympathetic Court sentenced him to 12 months' imprisonment. Seeing that the Douglasites believe the banks can create tens, hundreds, thousands, and millions of pounds at no cost except the actual writing of figures in a book, why did they not point out to the learned judge and the hard-hearted bank that the supposed theft of thousands of pounds was quite illusory, and that at most the bank had only been robbed of the time taken to make the entries, and the cost of pen, paper and ink—say 2s. 6d. in all?

A Political Curiosity.

A letter from Mr. J. Middleton Murry, a leader of the "Independent Socialist Party," to the *Times* Literary Supplement (December 6th, 1934):—

Sir,—I have no objection to being called a Communist, provided it is in a reasonable context, with proper qualifications. Mr. Wyndham Lewis's letter affords neither of these safeguards. Therefore, I wish to be allowed to say that within his frame of

reference I am not a Communist, but simply a democratic Socialist. When the term Communist is applied to me and used (as Mr. Lewis appears to use it) to suggest that I am an adherent of some Russian Communist orthodoxy, promulgated from Moscow, I must claim my correct "political" label. I was quite accurately described both by your reviewer and Mr. Heppenstall as the adherent of a Marxism which owes "as much to Blake and to Jesus, to Shakespeare and to Keats... as to Marx." I see no reason why this description should be simplified and distorted to suit polemical needs.

Yours very faithfully, J. MIDDLETON MURRY.

Labour Party's Lack of Socialist Convictions admitted by Mr. Herbert Morrison.

From a speech at the Paris Sorbonne (*Daily Herald*, December 1st, 1934):—

The British Labour Party is a Socialist Party. It believes that the existing economic muddle and confusion can only be effectively remedied by the public ownership, direction and planning of the nation's economic resources, and it desires to see a similar policy applied all over the world.

Definite Socialist convictions are not growing among the British electors as fast as their attachment to the more general and immediate ideas of the Labour Party.

Labour is particularly popular for its support of peace policies.

(It will be noticed that Mr. Morrison misuses the word Socialism by applying it to the schemes for rationalised and planned capitalism with which he and his party are so much concerned.)

When, last year, the Labour Party won a by-election at Swindon they did so in just the manner suggested in Mr. Morrison's speech, i.e., by soliciting the votes of non-Socialists who happened to be attracted by reforms and immediate issues. Read Dr. Addison's explanation of his victory, which he attributed to several things, but not to Socialist convictions among the electors:—

The new member as a Liberal was Minister of Munitions and Minister for Health, and after joining the Labour Party in 1923 was Minister of Agriculture in the last Labour Government.

After the result Dr. Addison said:—

"I attribute my victory very largely to the line I have taken on the issue of peace and the League of Nations. I believe that has appealed to many people, especially in these troublous times. Another point which has told strongly in my favour is the means test, for in the borough there are many cases of hardship. Generally the result shows that the people are tired of the National Government."

—(*Manchester Guardian*, October 27th, 1934.) 11.

MANCHESTER

Lectures will be given at the "Craigwell" Cafe, Peter Street, on Sunday Evenings, at 7.30 p.m.

March 3rd	-	-	"Practical Politics for the Impatient"	D. McKENZIE
"10th	-	-	"The Making of a Socialist"	J. I.E.A.
"17th	-	-	"Socialism and the Ballot Box"	E. BODEN
"24th	-	-	"Is there a Class Struggle in Russia?"	M. CAMERON
"31st	-	-	"The Material Basis of Art"	E. KERSLEY

Admission Free

Questions and Discussion

Christ as a Capitalist

On November 11th last year, there appeared in *The People* an interview with Mr. Ernest Thompson, the retiring Mayor of Louth, a "bustling" little town in Lincolnshire. Louth is a remarkable place for these pagan times. It is supposed to "bustle" with the Christian spirit. Mr. Thompson is also a Christian, but it is not the ordinary brand of Christianity. Mr. Thompson is a practical Christian. He believes that practical Christianity is the only remedy for present-day problems. "Not your so-called religion," he says, with a frank smile, "but practical Christianity—applied to every-day life, can solve all our problems—even that of unemployment."

At last the saviour! After nearly two thousand years of searching, the true Christian doctrine has been discovered, and we have to thank the Mayor of a "bustling" little town in Lincolnshire.

Of course, Mr. Thompson must have told *The People* that the reason why the workers are poor is because they produce wealth for the benefit of the master class, and not for themselves. Surely he pointed out that the profit-making nature of this system restricted the production of wealth and reduced millions of workers to the aggravated poverty of unemployment. There can be no doubt that he urged the establishment of a social system where goods shall be produced for use, and not for sale. What else could he say? Alas, no! What he said was:—

If employers would use their capital and possessions as Christ would have them used, then there would be no money lying idle in the banks and men would be trooping back to work. . . .

And how? As Christ had no possessions and despised them, the answer is obviously a lemon. But Mr. Thompson has solved the riddle. Mr.

Thompson, you see, does not keep all his eggs in one basket. He is a contractor as well as a practical Christian, and from all accounts he is a very practical contractor. He has begun work on a new housing scheme to provide work for the unemployed, because he had been "guided by God" to buy the land for that purpose. . . . And here is the gem—the master-stroke:—

The men I have employed are all working with the Christian spirit in their hearts—and that alone is going to have a sound practical result. . . . It means that they are working harder and better than they ever would have done. They are building the houses faster and, consequently, more cheaply than usual. And that means I shall be able to sell them at a lower price and develop the estate further. . . .

Councillor Thompson smiled. "You see," he said, "Christianity can be practical. . . ."

Such simplicity is positively staggering. Mind you, no mention is made of profits. But, remember, Mr. Thompson insists that the necessary condition for producing cheaper houses is harder work from his wage-slaves. Strange as it may seem, the Practical Christian, like any other sort of employer, wants to squeeze the utmost out of the workers. If this pious gentleman is only eager to find work for the unemployed in Louth, he would give them a five-hour day and urge them to take it easy. What should it matter to the Practical Christian if he gets no profits on his capital so long as it is used to make people happy? . . . "I do not profess to be a saint," said Mr. Thompson, "but I am convinced that here is the solution the world is looking for. . . ."

Mr. Thompson is certainly no saint. He is just a plain, simple, ordinary capitalist exploiter. KAYE.

Marx and the "Blackcoats"

It is a sign of the times that the name of Karl Marx is so often mentioned wherever social problems are discussed. His opponents, and they number many, including such bitter "opponents" of each other as Conservatives and Labourites, pay an unwitting tribute to the soundness of Marxism each time they attempt to "prove" Marx wrong.

To give an example of the manner in which his critics "dispose" of Marx, here is an extract from the *Daily Herald*, "Labour's own paper." Under the heading, "All Together," it printed a leader dealing with the proposed affiliation of the Medical Practitioners' Union to the T.U.C., which it described as being "full of significance." "The middle-class workers," it says (italics ours) "in the professions, in commerce, and in industry, are established in positions of great influence and

power. Their numbers are growing with astonishing rapidity. *The class whose decline Marx foretold in his certain accents* is expanding in numbers, growing in power and developing its own outlook as a great new factor in politics." (December 15th, 1934. Italics ours.)

"The class whose decline Marx foretold in his certain accents . . . ! Which class? In the *Daily Herald's* own words, the "middle-class workers! The managers, foremen, architects, clerks, salesmen, etc.? Since when have these types of workers constituted a separate class? And when and where did Marx "foretell their decline"? Not a word from the *Herald* in support of their allegation.

In fact, Marx quite clearly foresaw that the work of administration would be taken over by

the workers. In his work, "Capital," Marx says: "Just as at first the capitalist is relieved from actual labour so soon as his capital has reached that minimum amount with which capitalist production, as such, begins, so now, he hands over the work of direct and constant supervision of the individual workmen and groups of workmen, to a special kind of wage labourer. . . . The work of supervision becomes their established and exclusive function." (Vol. 1. Swan Sonnenschein. Edited by F. Engels. Page 322.)

Further, in dealing with clerks, etc., he states: "The commercial labourer, in the strict meaning of the term, belongs to the better-paid classes of wage-workers, he belongs to the class of skilled labourers, which is above the average. . . . The generalisation of public education makes it possible to recruit this line of labourers from classes that had formerly no access to such education and that were accustomed to a lower scale of living. . . . *The capitalist increases the number of these labourers whenever he has more value and profits to realise.*" (Italics ours. Vol. 3, Kerr and Co. Trans. by E. Untermann. Edited by F. Engels. Page 354.)

These are "certain accents" of Marx all right, but they give no support to the case of the *Daily Herald*. Marx did not make the mistake of confusing the better paid workers with the smaller capitalists, as the *Herald* writer apparently does.

Perhaps the "subjects" of this controversy, namely the *Daily Herald's* "middle-class workers," those who are established in positions of "great influence" and "power," may derive small comfort from what Karl Marx or the *Daily Herald* says about them. But they will sooner or later be forced to listen to what the Socialist Party has to say to them.

Firstly, there is no fundamental distinction between the workers by "hand" and those by "brain." In fact, all workers have to use both, and because all of them have to sell their working ability, whatever its character, to an employer for a livelihood, all of them belong to that economic category, the working-class.

The clerks, architects, and many other of the "superior" sections of the workers face the same problems, generally speaking, as tailors, bricklayers or engineers. All those problems can be traced to one root cause—the private ownership of the means of living. In many cases, the position of the professional workers and clerks is worse than that of their "manual" brethren. When in work, it is a constant struggle to keep up appearances; when out of work, some do not even get the dole. And mechanisation and rationalisation have wrought havoc in their ranks, too.

Therefore, the Socialist Party does not select particular sections of the working-class for special mention.

Misunderstanding of the Socialist case is prevalent amongst all grades of workers to-day. Professional workers do not possess some mental kink which will make it impossible for us to convert them. Even the snobbish outlook born of "semi-detacheds" in Suburbia cannot withstand for ever the bitter lessons which capitalism is teaching.

Marxian Socialism—Scientific Socialism—stands primarily for the recognition of the fact that the working-class, nine-tenths of the population here, cannot live without getting permission to use the land, the factories, railways, etc., from the capitalists who own them. This means nothing but slavery and exploitation for all working-men and women, no matter what their jobs are.

And therefore, we of the Socialist Party ask you, whether you are "black-coated workers, or workers with no coats at all, to join us?" Because the task we have set ourselves is the most vital of all, the task of taking the means of life out of the hands of the minority and securing them for common ownership. S. RUBIN.

Correction.

Owing to an oversight, the issues for November and December, 1934, and January, 1935, were printed as Vol. 32. This should have been Vol. 31, the volume running from September, 1934, to August, 1935.

"The Western Socialist"

Published by the Socialist Party of Canada is obtainable from the Socialist Party of Canada, Manitoba Hotel, 194, Market Avenue East, Winnipeg, at five cents a copy; or at 42, Great Dover Street, London, S.E.1, at 2d. per copy (2½d. post free).

THE WORKERS' SOCIALIST PARTY (U.S.A.)

Readers in U.S.A. are invited to communicate with the Workers' Socialist Party at 132, East 23rd Street, New York City, where the SOCIALIST STANDARD is obtainable.

THE SOCIALIST PARTY OF CANADA

Readers in Canada are invited to communicate with the Socialist Party of Canada at 194, Market Avenue, Winnipeg, where the WESTERN SOCIALIST and SOCIALIST STANDARD are obtainable.

INDEX to "SOCIALIST STANDARD"

A full Index for the year ended August, 1934, is on sale, price 2s. (post free 2½d.). Order from Literature Secretary, 42, Great Dover Street, S.E.1, or nearest branch.

Copies of the Index for the previous year are also on sale.

Open Air Meetings

Sundays:

		March 3rd	10th	17th	24th	31st
Regents Park	11.30 a.m.	Walker	Rubins	Cash	Isbitsky	Godfrey
Clapham Common	3 p.m.	Banks	Walker	Ross	Goldberg	Banks
Avenue Road, Clock Tower, Lewisham	7.30 p.m.	Reginald	Ross	Walker	Wilmot	Isbitsky

Mondays:

Ridley Road, Dalston, E.8 8 p.m.

Tuesdays:

Clissold Corner, Albion Road, N.16 8 p.m.

Wednesdays:

Windsor Road, Forest Gate, E. 8 p.m.

Thursdays:

Ridley Road, Dalston, E.8. 8 p.m. "Salmon and Ball," Bethnal Green, E. 8 p.m.

BRANCH DIRECTORY

BATTERSEA.—Sec., 2, Hanbury Road, S.W.11. Branch meets Thursday, 8.30 p.m., at The Waiting Room, Latchmere Baths, entrance in Burns Road.

BIRMINGHAM.—Sec., E. Jesper, 38, Rollason Road, Erdington, Branch meets Jeans Café, Newton Street. First Wednesday in month at 8 p.m.

BLOOMSBURY.—Branch meets every Monday at 7.30 p.m., at A.E.U. Hall, 39, Doughty Street, W.C. (Near Grays Inn, Road.) Sec., Miss B. Foster, 2, Old Gloucester Street, W.C.1.

CENTRAL.—Membership obtained only through the Ex-Committee. Applications to General Sec.

CHISWICK.—(See West London).

DAGENHAM.—Branch meets alternate Mondays (from 4th February, at 8 p.m., Pettitts' Farm, Heathway. Sec. H. Berry, 5, Cannington Road, Dagenham, Essex.

ECCLES.—Branch meets 1st and 3rd Mondays in month at Railway Temperance Room, Four Bridges, Wellington Road, 7.30 p.m. Lecture and discussion, 8.45. Non-members invited. Secretary, Mrs. F. LEA, 5, Gaskell Road, Eccles, Lancs.

EDINBURGH.—Communications to Sec., D. Lamond, at 15, Barclay Place.

GLASGOW.—Branch meets 2nd and 4th Mondays in month, 8 p.m., at 98 Naburn Street, Glasgow, C.5. Communications to M. Falconer at above address.

HACKNEY.—Branch meets Friday, 7.30 p.m., at Old Gravel Pit Hall, Vallette Street, E.9. Lecture after each meeting. Communication to Sec., E. Hatwell, 36, Haggerston Road, Dalston, E.8.

ILFORD.—Branch meets Mondays at 8 p.m. at 142, Richmond Road. Discussion after Branch business. Communications to Sec., at above address.

ISLINGTON.—All communications to F. W., 92, Wellington Road, Holloway, N.2. Branch meets on Fridays at 8 to 10.30 p.m., at Room 4, Co-operative Hall, 129, Seven Sisters Road, N.

LEYTON.—Communications to Sec., Dick Jacobs, 12, Clifford Rd., Walthamstow, E.17. Branch meets Thursday, 8 p.m., at Trades Hall, Grove House, High Road, Leyton.

LEWISHAM.—Branch meets Thursdays, at 8 p.m., at The Anchor Club Room, Lewisham Road. Communications to H. A. Russell, 73, Kimberley Road, Nunhead, S.E.15.

MANCHESTER.—Branch meets fortnightly (Mondays) as from 14 Jan., at Craigwell Restaurant, Peter Street (entrance in South Street). Sec., B. A. Lee, 19, Emery Avenue, Chorlton, Manchester.

PADDINGTON.—Branch meeting held on 2nd Friday, and lecture with discussion on 4th Friday in each month, 8 p.m., in the guild room over "Co-op. Stores," 447, Harrow Road, W.10. Literature Sec., W. Veal, 73, Wornington Road, W.10.

ROMFORD.—Branch meets alternate Tuesdays at 8 p.m. commencing February 5th (open to public) at N.U.R. Club, Albert Road. Business followed by Lecture and discussion. Secy. P. Golding, "Basra," Boscombe Ave., Hornchurch.

SHEFFIELD.—Sec., G. H. Southey, 83, Wallace Road, Sheffield, 3. Branch meets alternate Mondays, 7.30 p.m. at Room 2, A.E.U. Institute, Stanley Street.

SOUTHEND-ON-SEA.—Branch meets 1st and 3rd Wednesday in the month, at 8 p.m. at 6, Hermitage Road, Westcliff. Discussion after branch business. Non-members invited. Communications to Sec. at above address.

SOUTHWARK.—Branch meets Fridays at 8 p.m., 42, Great Dover St., S.E.1. Communications to Sec., at above address.

STEPNEY.—Sec., S. Goldstein, 18, Irene House, Flower & Dene Street, Stepney, E.1. Branch meets on Fridays, at 8 p.m., at Working Lads Institute (nr. Whitechapel Station).

TOOTING.—Branch meets 1st Sunday in the month, at 12 o'clock at "The Springfield Social Club," 590, Garrett Lane, S.W.17 (Opposite Burntwood Lane).

TOTTENHAM.—Branch meets 1st and 3rd Fridays in the month, 7, Bruce Grove, Room 2. Discussion after branch business. Public invited. Communications to C. Godfrey, 49, Napier Road, Tottenham, N.17.

WEST HAM.—Sec., G. J. Giles, 22, Colegrave Road, Stratford, E. Branch meets Whitehall School, Parliament Place, Forest Gate, every Thursday at 8 p.m.

WEST LONDON (Chiswick).—Branch meets Fridays, 8 p.m., at Chiswick Club, over 376, High Road, Chiswick, W.4. Communications to Sec., C. Curtis, 52, Parkstead Road, Putney, S.W.15.

WEMBLEY.—Communications to H. G. Holt, 28, Charterhouse Avenue, Wembley, Middlesex. Branch meets every Friday at 8 p.m. in the Elm Hotel Annexe, St. John's Road, off High Road, Wembley.

WOOD GREEN.—Communications to Sec. at 44, Boreham Road, Wood Green, N.22. Branch meets 2nd and 4th Wednesday in month at 8.30 p.m., Stirling House, Stuart Crescent.

THE SOCIALIST STANDARD

The Official Organ of **THE SOCIALIST PARTY** of Great Britain.

No. 368. Vol. 31]

London, April, 1935

[Monthly, Twopence

*The Modern .
System of . .
industry will
not work . .
without some
unemployed .
margin—some
reserve of . .
labour . . .*

—C. Booth.

British Workers Ready— TO SELL THEIR TOES TO A FRENCH CAPITALIST!

In that popular rag, *The People*, under date of January 27th, it is stated that there are scores of men and women in Britain who would be willing to sell their toes—for hard cash. The prospective purchaser is a young Frenchwoman who lost her little toe in a motor car accident. She states that she is willing to pay handsomely for a suitable toe, which her surgeon is confident that he will be able to graft on to his patient's foot. According to the same paper, scores of men and women in Britain have signified their willingness to sell their toes in exchange for cash. Such are the facts, and many other similar cases will at once arise in the minds of our readers.

Now form a mental picture of the position.

On the one hand a young Frenchwoman, wealthy, living upon the surplus wealth produced by the workers, possibly the possessor of one or more motor cars, injures herself in a car accident, perhaps through her own fault. It is not suggested that this lady is a super being who, by some different bodily or mental functions, has risen to or been

placed in a position where she is able to command others. The very fact that practically any other human little toe can be grafted on in place of the lost one implies a biological similarity. Hence, it is only by her command over wealth that she is able to exercise her command over human beings.

Now it is stated that scores of men and women in Britain have signified their willingness to part with their toes. It is unlikely that members of the capitalist class would be inspired by a sense of gallantry to undergo the necessary operation. The same reasoning fits the case of employed workers. It is therefore reasonable to assume that the majority of those who have made such offers are unemployed workers or their wives.

Thus we have, on the one hand, workers who cannot find a master, living in a state of such dire poverty that many have been driven to commit suicide, ready to be transported to foreign soil, to be placed under an anæsthetic, and to have their toe cut off, in order to supply this necessary missing link to a charming young Frenchwoman.

In attendance upon the lady will be the surgeon, the anæsthetist, the nurses, together with the necessary quorum of male and female servants.

Why, it may be asked, should not the rôles be reversed? Why, supposing a worker loses a hand or an arm when attending dangerous machinery, should not a member of the capitalist class be operated upon and have the necessary portion of his anatomy removed and grafted on to that of the useful worker? There is obviously only one answer to this, and that is that the owners of wealth are their own masters and would refuse to oblige, whilst unemployed workers, having no wealth, and driven on by the potent whip of

ON OTHER PAGES

	Page
Book for Students of	
Currency Problems	114
Notes by the Way ...	117
Socialism and Foreign	
Trade ...	119
Mussolini's "Corpora-	
tive State" Jest ...	120
Politics and Party	
Funds... ..	120
Socialist Party of	
Australia ...	121
Debate with Fascist...	122
The Socialist Forum	125
The Industrial	
Revolution	127
Meetings, Lectures and	
Discussions—	119, 124 and 127

hunger, are forced to seek even the most uncongenial ways of supplementing the meagre means doled out to them by the wealth-owners.

Thus we see that there is on the one side a class who, by virtue of their possession of wealth—and in capitalist society this means ownership and control of the means of production (land, mines, and factories)—are a dominant class, imposing their will upon another class, the workers, who are forced to sell their labour power in order to live.

Obviously, therefore, the interest of the

workers is opposed to that of the capitalists, but until they realize this fact and the fact of their slave position in society, they will continue to suffer from the poverty, insecurity, and unemployment which is their lot to-day.

The Socialist message, however, is a message of hope, and once the workers understand their position, they will be ready to organize for the capture of the political machinery and the introduction of a new system of society based upon the common ownership and democratic control of the means of production.

R. M.

A Book for Students of Currency Problems

Mr. H. J. Welch, author of "Money, Foreign Trade and Exchange" (George Allen & Unwin, 4/6) is not an economist or a banker, but he writes with a sounder understanding of the functions and powers of banks than do many professional economists and bankers. His book is short and really consists of three separate essays held together by the fact that all deal with financial problems. It is with the first and longest essay which treats of banking and currency, that we are concerned. Mr. Welch opposes the old delusion, which has enjoyed a revival in recent years, that banks create credit, criticises the MacMillan Committee for its adherence to this view, and shows that "both loans and investments by banks can only be provided and made out of monies deposited by the public and therefore out of assets representing such deposits." In other words, he puts forward the same view as has been consistently maintained in these pages.

Mr. Welch does what is too seldom done by those who discuss problems of banking and credit. He goes behind the monetary phenomena. This enables him to show that "all assets . . . belong ultimately to members of the public and . . . can be divided into two main classes (a) assets held by the public through the banks, and (b) assets held by the public through direct ownership." This is the crux of the whole matter. Immediately this fact is appreciated the hollowness of the credit creationist's arguments stands revealed.

It is not necessary to examine Mr. Welch's presentation of his case in detail. The whole subject of credit creation has been dealt with at length already in recent numbers of the SOCIALIST STANDARD (see issues of November and December, 1933, and May, 1934). The main arguments set out in this book can be endorsed and with a few provisos set out below it can be recommended for study. First there is the statement on page 53, "that if more currency notes are taken into circulation by the public . . . while the Bank holds notes in its Banking Department the increase of circulation would come out of them, in exchange

for which the Bank would receive bank money, thus increasing the amount available for investment by it by the value of the notes issued." Surely this is at conflict with common sense and with the analytical table on pages 54-55. If an individual decides to increase his holding of currency notes, he draws them from his bank, thereby reducing his deposit with the bank, which then replenishes its stock of notes by drawing on its account with the Banking Department of the Bank of England. In other words, the bank's deposit with the Bank of England is reduced by an amount corresponding to the increase in the amount of currency notes in circulation, and the Banking Department's reserve of currency notes is correspondingly reduced. We fail to see how if this happens there can be any increase in the amount available for investment by the Bank of England.

There are two other statements made by Mr. Welch which appear unsound. On pages 35 and 36 he seems to have fallen into the error, committed by those who hold the views regarding credit which he attacks, of thinking that the price level is dependent upon credit policy. The statement that "it is the mismanagement of bank loans and investments that constitutes the financial danger to the value of the currency" (page 36) and the implication contained in the bottom paragraph on page 35 that the price level is affected if a Government borrows for any purpose except to bridge the time lag between the inflow of revenue and the outflow of expenditure, or to meet capital expenditure or "unavoidable deficits on revenue account" (what are unavoidable deficits?) are of the kind repeatedly made by those who magnify the powers of the banks. Furthermore, they are inconsistent with other statements made by Mr. Welch regarding the importance of controlling the volume of currency. History provides numerous examples of budgetary deficits and government borrowings which had no effect on the level of prices.

One comment we would like to make on Mr. Welch's treatment of the subject. By stating, as he does, that he believes that the theory that

"banks have powers of creating money beyond the invested savings of the community voluntarily deposited with them . . . involves a serious fallacy which may have a dangerous effect upon the minds of people generally and especially upon the working classes (sic) and their leaders," he raises the doubt in the reader's mind whether it was not political fear rather than scientific thought which led him to his views. If the credit creationists are right it is, from the scientific point of view, immaterial whether their theories are politically dangerous for certain existing interests. We maintain that they are wrong and that therefore the workers ought not to waste their time with schemes for nationalising the banks. We urge them to take the whole world and let the banks and credit go.

The MacMillan Report and "Credit Creation"

Mr. Welch deserves credit for publicly challenging the correctness of the statements regarding loans and deposits contained in the MacMillan Report. It is a pity, however, that he contented himself with merely quoting Mr. Walter Leaf and giving his own arguments. There is a regrettable tendency for everything appearing in the MacMillan Report to be taken as dogma and for the fact to escape notice that there are individuals, as competent to form judgments on banking questions, as were the members of the Committee, who do not agree with their statements regarding the relationship between bank loans and deposits. The MacMillan Committee was appointed in November, 1929. It consisted of 14 members, of whom two were monetary economists, and five were bankers. Whatever the qualifications of the banking members of the committee may be nobody would deny the existence of other bankers with equal or larger banking experience and at least as competent to express opinions on matters of banking practice and theory. The other seven members of the committee, it is fair to assume, had not, prior to their appointment, made any specialised study and did not have any profound understanding of banking theory and practice. The Committee was appointed to inquire, among other things, "into banking, finance and credit, paying regard to the factors both internal and international which govern their operation." In view of their terms of reference and of the fact that half of the Committee were neither monetary economists nor bankers, and that economists are not in agreement regarding the relationship between loans and deposits, it might have been expected that some evidence would have been called on this subject so that the Committee could form a considered judgment on what is a fundamental question. In fact, no evidence was called on this point. No witness was asked, "Do banks create credit?", or, "how can a bank receiving a deposit

of £1,000 create credit to nine times the amount of the deposit?" Nevertheless, 14 estimable individuals, few of whom had any qualifications to make a judgment on the matter without hearing evidence, committed themselves to the statement that banks "create credit." That they did so is rather astounding, particularly when it is considered that one of the two monetary economists on the Committee had, only two years earlier, made statements which suggested that he was of a different opinion. Dr. Gregory, in the essay which he contributed to "London Essays in Economics in honour of Dr. Cannan" (1927), wrote as follows:—

The dominant theory in the country to-day asserts that the volume of deposits . . . is controlled not by the wishes of depositors . . . but by the will of bankers. . . . Professor Cannan attacked these views at every point . . . (and) has not the slightest difficulty in showing that the detailed supports of the fashionable view are erroneous and that the facts can be easily explained without a recourse to it at all. (Pages 54, 55 and 57.)

It is interesting to note that a few years after he had presided over the Committee on Finance and Industry in this country Lord MacMillan went to Canada to preside over a Royal Commission on banking. That committee did cross-examine witnesses on the question, "Did banks create credit?" At least Mr. Jackson Dodds, President of the Canadian Bankers' Association, in a speech made by him while on a visit to this country, stated that "fellow bankers who were engaged in that much-maligned business of borrowing money from depositors and lending it out . . . would sympathise with him when he said he spent 12 hours (being) cross-examined on such questions as "Did banks create credit?" (*The Times*, June 13th, 1934.) Mr. Jackson Dodd's correct description of the relationship between deposits and loans indicates his own opposition to the credit creationist illusion.

In any event the adoption of a particular view by the MacMillan Committee does not constitute proof of its correctness and when it is remembered that other leading bankers deny that banks create credit there is justification for challenging the Committee's unsupported assertion to the contrary. The following statements made by bankers might be quoted in support of Mr. Welch's opposition to the Committee.

Mr. W. W. Paine, a director of Lloyds Bank Ltd., in a letter to the *Daily Mail* (December 5th, 1933) wrote, "Many eminent bankers—the late Dr. Leaf, chairman of the Westminster Bank, among them—hold that the joint stock banks do not even create credit by the grant of loans to their customers out of depositors' money. . . . I have no hesitation in saying that (the) statement (that banks do not lend their depositors' money but literally create the money they lend) is absolutely wrong so far as practical banking is concerned."

Mr. F. L. Bland, a director of Barclays Bank Ltd., in his inaugural address as president of the Institute of Bankers said, "Money, saved in smaller or larger sums, tended to aggregate . . . the commercial banks were essentially not much more than the channels through which those aggregate funds moved to their final destination. . . . Bankers could not create money in the sense of wealth: that popular illusion was widespread and needed definite contradiction." (*The Times*, November 15th, 1934.)

The opinion of the Chairman of the National Bank of Australasia (Sir John Grice) is as follows, "The main function of the banks is to manage, not to control, credit, and not to create it, receiving deposits and, after reserving a reasonable percentage in cash, to invest or lend the remainder safely to the best advantage." (*The Times*, June 30th, 1931.)

In his recent speech at the general meeting of Martins Bank, Mr. E. B. Orme, the chairman, said, "Deposits are entrusted to us by our customers . . . we are eager to lend our deposits to approved borrowers." (*The Times*, January 23rd, 1935.)

Many other statements by bankers to the same effect could be quoted, but the above are sufficient to show that there is no justification for assuming that the MacMillan Committee's view is unchallenged by banking authorities.

The best known English economist who rejects the credit creation theory is Dr. Cannan. His views on the subject are set out in an essay entitled, "The difference between a bank and a cloakroom," to be found in his book, "An Economist's Protest," and in his "Modern Currency and the Regulation of its Value." We have yet to read a satisfactorily convincing reply to the arguments on which Dr. Cannan bases his case.

The latest public rejection of the theory that banks create credit was made by the City Editor of *The Times*. In a lengthy reference in the issue of January 21st to Mr. Welch's book, he accepts the latter's views on the subject. It is interesting to observe, in passing, that in a review of the same book, *The Times* Literary Supplement has the following: "(Mr. Welch) has seen fit to revive the discredited view that the banks have no power to 'create credit.' It might have been hoped that this view would no longer be resuscitated after it had been repudiated unanimously by the MacMillan Committee, which included both bankers and economists, and represented all schools of thought." (*T.L.S.*, December 6th, 1934.) The claim that the MacMillan Committee ought to be considered the final arbiters on the subject has been dealt with above, the claim that the Committee represented all schools of thought is equally untenable, and something more than the mere

assertion of *The Times* Literary Supplement is wanted to prove that the view that the banks have no power to create credit is discredited. That view may be unfashionable, but as one of the members of the MacMillan Committee wrote in relation to this very matter, "It is really not so important to be fashionable as it is to be correct."

To revert to the comments made by the City Editor of *The Times*, his adherence to the non-creation theory seems to be based on political fears rather than on any real understanding of the subject, and when he states that "it would be truer to say that the customer creates the credit by borrowing (from the bank)" he falls into another fatal error and reveals a failure properly to understand the problem. The City Editor of the *Daily Herald* (December 22nd) seized on this astounding statement and used it as a peg on which to hang an article putting forward the credit creation view. But instead of attempting to prove his case the City Editor of the *Herald* simply quoted the MacMillan Report, as though that clinched the matter. One thing ought to make anyone connected with the *Herald* pause before asserting that banks create credit.

If banks can lend ten times the amount they borrow (i.e., receive in the form of deposits), their earning capacity must greatly exceed that of any ordinary concern which cannot use in its business more than its own capital and reserves plus whatever amounts it borrows in one form or another. Now Odhams Press, Ltd., which owns the *Daily Herald*, is such an ordinary concern. In 1933, the last year for which figures have been published, the profits of Odhams Press, Ltd., available to pay a dividend on the ordinary shares amounted to over 37 per cent. of the ordinary share capital and a dividend of 15 per cent. was actually paid. Last year the Midland Bank Ltd., to take a typical joint stock bank, made profits equal to about 20 per cent. of the amount of ordinary share capital and paid a dividend of 16 per cent. How does the Editor of the *Daily Herald* explain that Odhams Press, Ltd., make profits at nearly double the rate of the Midland Bank if the latter has the advantage of creating credit, which earns profits, out of nothing and at no cost?

"Credit Creation" an Ancient Superstition.

If the City Editor of the *Daily Herald* took the trouble really to study the question he might not be so ready to quote the MacMillan Report as though it was ultimate truth. The whole question is an old one, and has its roots in the discussions of what were known as the Currency and Banking Schools which accompanied the return to special payments after the Napoleonic War, and the passing of the Bank Charter Act of 1844. The present-day credit creation theory does not repre-

sent a new revolutionary discovery but the taking up of an old set of ideas, rejected during the second half of the XIXth century. During that time the real nature of banking was probably more widely known than it is to-day. Marx correctly described the functions of bankers in the following passage from Vol. III of "Capital":—

Borrowing and lending money becomes their (the bankers') particular business. They step as middle-

men between the actual lender and the borrower of capital . . . so that in place of the individual money-lender the bankers face the industrial and commercial capitalists in the capacity of representatives of all money-lenders. They become the general managers of the money capital . . . they concentrate the borrowers against all lenders, and borrow for the entire world of commerce. A bank's . . . profit is generally made by borrowing at a lower rate of interest than it loans. (Vol. III, pages 472-3.)

B. S.

Notes by the Way

Hitler—Instrument of Capitalism

The Times, misled by its ill-informed experts who cannot distinguish between Labourism and Socialism, between reforming capitalism and abolishing it, has often got itself into a fearsome muddle trying to understand the function and effects of State control and State capitalism. Now, studying the examples of Germany and U.S.A., *The Times* is gradually beginning to see things as they are, and is discovering that State control may be not only not harmful but even helpful to the well-being of capitalism. The following is from a *Times* leader on the policy of Hitler and his economic superman, Dr. Schacht:—

Dr. Schacht has accordingly been driven step by step to assume control over almost every department of economic life, not for the purpose of introducing Socialism—for he has always declared himself an enemy of Socialism—but with the object of preventing the depreciation of the mark which would immediately take place if the control were relaxed.

This paradoxical attempt to preserve capitalism by the imposition of State control is, however, not quite so strange as it appears to be at first sight. Like President Roosevelt, Dr. Schacht is attempting in his own way to save capitalism from itself in a country which, unlike the United States, has for generations, even for centuries, been used to a large measure of State control. His anti-Socialist professions may therefore be taken at their face value. Indeed it has been plain for some months that the economic policy of the National-Socialist Government of Herr Hitler has been setting in a direction very far removed from that advocated by the more radical members of the party. Two recent events may be cited—the dismissal of Gottfried Feder, one of the founders of the party and the inspirer of the economic programme with its famous catchword, "interest-slavery," which contributed so much to its success in capturing the electorate; and the report of the Commission on Banking which has rejected decisively the suggestion of nationalisation, though the State already owns a large portion of the banking system.

(*Times*, December 28th, 1934.)

* * * * *

Schacht Borrows some "Labour" Panaceas

The next passage in the same editorial is interesting for several reasons. We see Dr. Schacht borrowing from our own Labour Party and I.L.P. their doctrine of State interference to direct the flow of investment—as if that mattered a brass farthing to the working class or to the Socialist movement. We also see Hitler's Germany introducing all the multifarious restrictions

on the individual which anti-Socialists used to allege, falsely, against Socialism.

The new banking legislation does, however, establish a much more rigid control by the Reichsbank of the activities of the deposit banks, and one of its objects appears to be to give the central institution much greater powers of directing the flow of savings and investments into channels devised by the Government. For Dr. Schacht, it must be remembered, besides being President of the Reichsbank, is also Minister for Economic Affairs, and, though his policy seems equally removed from either Marxian or National Socialism, it appears for the moment to be set on the lines of a kind of bureaucratic State capitalism, very much in the Prussian tradition of Frederick the Great. Within the last two years the freedom of the individual entrepreneur has all but vanished; his prices are controlled, his profits are limited, his supplies of raw material are regulated, and his output is largely determined for him; in fact, he can hardly move hand or foot without permission from Dr. Schacht in one or other of his dual capacities. It would be interesting to speculate whether this economic dictatorship is intended to become a permanent feature of the "third Reich," or whether it is to be regarded merely as a temporary device for meeting the economic crisis. On the answer to this question the whole future of National-Socialism as an economic system depends. Is Herr Hitler ultimately destined to become the tool of the big industrial financiers or the founder of a new social order?

Of course, we need hardly add that the question *The Times* raises as to the possibility of Hitler introducing a new social order is an idle one. A new social order—of which Socialism is the only conceivable kind—is not coming at the behest of any leader marshalling non-Socialist masses, whether his method be the demagogic oratory of a Maxton or Cripps, or the bayonets and bullets of Hitler and Stalin.

* * * * *

Communists and the League of Nations, or the Tale of Two Years Ago

In August, 1932, the Communist-inspired Anti-War Congress was held at Amsterdam, attended by 2,196 delegates, from 27 countries, representing 30,000 organisations and 30 million people—at least, that is what the report says. ("United Front Against War," price 1d., 53, Gray's Inn Road, W.C.1). Among the British delegates were such well-known Communists as Mr. Tom Mann, Mr. Aitken Ferguson, Mr. Saklatvala, Mrs. Bramley, Mr. Strachey, and Mr. Hannington.

The Congress issued a manifesto which con-

tains a very forthright denunciation of the League of Nations:—

Above all, the Congress warns the public against Governmental institutions, and especially the League of Nations, which functions at Geneva as the immediate mouthpiece of the imperialist powers. The words spoken at its great pompous ceremonies are words of peace, but its acts are the acts of war. . . .

Mr. Marcel Cachin, the leader of the French Communists, says the report,

expressed admirably the utter disillusionment of the workers with the League of Nations and all that it stands for.

He said:—

The fight against war is impossible without a clear condemnation of the Geneva brand of pacifism.

Now Russia is in the League of Nations, and all our Communists have had to swallow their words. They are now willy-nilly defending Russia's action and fostering just those pacifist illusions they formerly condemned.

* * * * *

Coals to Newcastle

The Right Hon. Thomas Johnston, Lord Privy Seal in the Labour Government, is one of those who have worked hard to develop trading relations between British manufacturers and the Russian Government. He has urged for many years that if only the Government would adopt a helpful attitude in the question of trading relations, facilitate the granting of credits and so on, there would be the gain of a big new market for British exporters, and employment for many thousands of men and women now unemployed.

Simultaneously, in the columns of *Forward* and elsewhere Mr. Johnston has given publicity to and has accepted as correct the claims of the Russians as to the stupendous strides made by Russian industry. Recently, writing in the *Daily Herald* (October 19th), Mr. Johnston put forward a scheme for a £100 million loan to Russia, guaranteed by the British Government, and having as its object enabling the Russians to buy goods in this country. He mentioned what kind of goods: "Russia needs shoes and clothes and woollens and consumers' goods of all kinds."

The question at once presents itself: How does Mr. Johnston square his scheme for selling these articles in Russia with the Bolsheviks' claim that the industrialisation plans have been an amazing success? Does one send coals to Newcastle? Can it be Mr. Johnston's latter-day view that the Russians' claims are distinctly inflated, and that the stories of desperate poverty brought back from Russia by many visitors have a substantial basis?

* * * * *

Are we Imitators?

The Times Literary Supplement (October 11th) in a review of several books about the Labour

Party, raises an interesting point. The reviewer writes:—

It will be observed that in the important matter of correlating means to ends Socialist thought is entirely imitative. After Lenin's success in Russia it dreamt of violent revolution everywhere. When this dream was shattered, the defeat of the Kapp Putsch caused it to pin its hopes to the general strike; and now that the strike weapon has been countered, its ideal is a Socialist Hitler. For a movement which claims to be able to regenerate the world, Socialism is curiously lacking in originality of technique.

Remembering that to *The Times Literary Supplement* "Socialists" means the Labour Party, no one can quarrel with the view expressed here. It certainly is true that the Labour Party in Great Britain and its associated parties abroad lack a fundamental basis and are therefore liable to be swept this way and that by every wind that blows.

If, however, the writer of the paragraph had really meant Socialists, and not Labourites, his statement would be patently untrue. The S.P.G.B. has never wavered on its Socialist aim, its acceptance of democratic methods, its firm adherence to the principle of independence or its unswerving opposition to capitalist war. It never toyed with the idea of armed insurrection, general strikes to overthrow capitalism, dictatorship, Fascism, pacifism, militarism. It might do *The Times* writer good to begin studying Socialism.

* * * * *

Mr. H. G. Wells Learns—a Little Late

During the war Mr. H. G. Wells and other public men were used by the Government to put over propaganda here and abroad useful to the ruling class in the prosecution of the war and in the deception of the workers. When they were told at the time that they were just paid hirelings of the capitalist class they indignantly denied it. Now, late in the day, Mr. H. G. Wells admits the truth. Writing in the *Daily Herald* (October 29th, 1934) he said:

We were, in fact, decoys. Just as T. E. Lawrence . . . was used all unawares as a decoy for the Arabs. And all for nothing! Plainly, I had not learnt the A.B.C. of diplomacy.

Of course, the fact that Wells has learned a lesson in one direction will not prevent him from trying to teach before he has learned in other directions.

* * * * *

A Political Mystery

A Mr. R. W. G. McKay, writing in the *Birmingham Town Crier*, formerly an organ of the I.L.P. and now organ of the Labour Party, is mystified. This is his problem:—

Australia presents a paradox to the student of politics because, although in the different States and the Commonwealth there have been Labour Governments for 20 years, very little truly Socialist legislation is to be found throughout the country.

(*Town Crier*, January 4th.)

This is his principal solution:—

the Labour Parties in Australia . . . have always been more anxious to use any power which they have obtained for procuring small social benefits than they have been willing to refuse the opportunity to obtain small advantages in order to wait and bring about a Socialist State.

This is a very superficial explanation. The party leaders believed in reforms (and in the sweets of office) and the Labour voters believed in reforms. What possible justification could any of them see, therefore, in refusing office when they had the chance?

We are, however, interested in an aspect about which Mr. McKay is silent. He tells us that there is no Socialism in Australia and unless the Labour Party changes considerably "no hope for Socialism in Australia at all." We never supposed there was any Socialism in Australia, but the *Town Crier* is not so placed. The I.L.P., of which it was once an organ, for years sold pamphlets called "Socialism in Practice" and "Socialism in Queensland," giving us highly-coloured accounts of the Socialism which was supposed to be the social system there. On the part of the I.L.P. it was just plain ignorance of what Socialism means—as the S.P.G.B. informed them at the time. There is every indication that Mr. McKay, in spite of his curt dismissal of social reforms, is still in a fog, and cannot distinguish between State Capitalism and Socialism.

H.

This Month's Quotation

The quotation on the front page is from "Life and Labour" (Vol. I., p. 152), by the late Charles Booth.

MEETINGS and LECTURES

All of the lectures announced here are open to non-members. Admission free. Questions and discussion are welcomed.

BLOOMSBURY

Lectures will be given on Monday evenings at A.E.U. Hall, 39, Doughty Street (Corner of Guildford Street), W.C.1. at 8.30 p.m.

- | | | | |
|-----------|---|---|-----------|
| April 1st | - | "State Planning and Economic Nationalism" | A. KOHN |
| " 8th | - | "Cross Currents of Capitalism" | C. LESTOR |
| " 15th | - | "Marx, Engels and the Labour Movement" | M. BARITZ |
| " 29th | - | "Materialism and Communism" | ISBITSKY. |

WOOD GREEN

Lectures at Stirling House, 4 Stuart Crescent (behind War Memorial), Wood Green, at 8 p.m., Wednesday.

- | | | | |
|------------|---|---------------------------------------|---------|
| April 10th | - | "The Trump Card of the Working Class" | LESTOR. |
| " 24th | - | "The Coming General Election" | |

For other Meetings see page 127.

Socialism and Foreign Trade

Under the above heading an article appeared in the *Liverpool Daily Post* of November 26th, 1934, by the Hon. Leonard Cripps. As is only to be expected, the Hon. Leonard writes from the point of view of a member of the master-class.

"Hardly a country in the world exists," he says, "in which we, as individuals, are not large owners of property and providers of services." According to him, nationalisation in England (which he confuses with Socialism) would cause other countries to follow suit, with the result that the supply of foodstuffs and so on from abroad would cease.

Famine would be the end of the experiment.

This would no doubt be the result of any attempt to impose "Socialism" in this tight little island independently of the rest of the world. No Socialist, however, proposes any such thing. Capitalism, being an international system, can only be abolished internationally by the combined action of the workers. One might as well talk of the establishment of "Socialism" in Liverpool and show the chaos that would result, as waste time enlarging upon the effects of such an experiment on the scale of a single small country such as England.

The workers of Britain, however, like the workers elsewhere, have a definite interest in terminating the present system. It is not they who own the millions invested abroad nor do they share in the loot of the colonies and profit made from the labour of the undeveloped races, though many so-called Communists (such as Mr. Palme Dutt) appear to think so.

Socialism will substitute for trading on the private account of individual capitalists, the collective organisation of distribution throughout the world, on behalf of the community. From the workers' point of view this is the only rational solution to the struggle for markets, involving periodical wars (in which the workers lose their lives uselessly) accompanied by wholesale attempts to restrict production while the workers are invited to tighten their belts a bit more to let the mad game go on. Nothing is easier than to understand the Hon. Leonard's objection to Socialism. It means the world for the workers. E. B.

Comrade W. Reynolds

W. Reynolds, of Stepney Branch, is asked to communicate with the Branch Secretary.

A Ramble

to Dorking and Shere on Easter Monday
Meet on Waterloo Station, near Platform 1, at 9.15 a.m. Fare 2/9 return.

THE SOCIALIST STANDARD

APRIL,



1935

OFFICIAL NOTICE

All communications for the Executive Committee. Subscriptions for the *SOCIALIST STANDARD*, Articles, and Correspondence submitted for insertion therein, should be addressed—The Socialist Party of Great Britain, 42, Great Dover Street, London, S.E.1, to whom Money Orders should be made payable.

The meetings of the Executive Committee are held at the Head Office, every Tuesday, at 7.30 p.m.

Mussolini's "Corporative State" Jest

One of the propaganda stunts of the Fascists all over the world is their promise to replace "political" control by "corporative" control, i.e., that the ultimate control of industry and all economic affairs should be handed over to a body representing employers and workers in industry, transport, etc. Parliament and the present State power in Italy were to be replaced by a Corporative Legislature. Mussolini has been in undisputed power now for 14 years, and he has carried out his pledge to the very last word, or rather, to the last word but one. He has established his Council of Corporations and has created his 22 corporations, representing different industries. He has given them—on paper—wide powers, but he has discreetly provided that they may do nothing whatever without the consent of Parliament and of himself as head of the State. Read the following account by the Rome correspondent of the *Observer* (November 18th, 1934):—

We must remember that the law of 1930, instituting the Council of Corporations, is still in being. It established that the Council, and, therefore, the corporations of to-day, cannot pass legislative measures regarding those subjects which have been regulated already by laws passed in Parliament. This prudent reservation avoids confusion, and also shows how successive developments will come about.

The Council of Corporations, on the other hand, has the right to form any regulations referring to collective and economic relations which have not passed through Parliament, and these are fully valid so long as they bear the signature of Mussolini. This limitation is the only one to be withdrawn so as to arrive at a complete Corporative Parliament.

From this we perceive that the Council can do everything on paper, and nothing important in fact. Not only must they not infringe Parliamentary statutes, but their own acts are invalid without Mussolini's signature; and he is himself President of every one of the 22 corporations!

Politics and Party Funds

The possession of huge funds will not alone create a movement nor will lack of funds destroy one, but money can go a long way towards achieving speedy success where conditions are otherwise ripe. Nothing shows so clearly as the inflow of funds the gulf between the Socialist movement and its many rivals, from Labour to Conservative. The S.P.G.B. is always hampered by lack of resources, and even its present limited expenditure is only met with difficulty from the small donations of workers who cannot afford more. Not so with the other parties. There is going on at the moment a revolt led by Churchill against Baldwin's leadership of the Conservative Party. At once it is announced in the *News Chronicle* that "associates of a well-known millionaire are willing to spend £200,000 in forcing both the resignation of the Prime Minister and the withdrawal of the India Bill." (*N.C.*, March 4th.) Parallel with this is the Government's semi-official propaganda organisation managed by the Postmaster-General, Sir Kingsley Wood. When this was first announced some months ago it was widely reported that wealthy business men had supplied the necessary campaign funds.

Mr. Randolph Churchill, a member of his father's rebel Conservative group, stated on February 24th that "he was already assured of powerful financial backing." (*Evening Standard*, March 4th.) Rumour has it that Lady Houston is one of the backers, and Lord Rothermere another.

Everyone knows that Sir Oswald Mosley's political adventures have not been financed on the subscriptions of his misguided or place-hunting followers. When he formed the New Party tens of thousands of pounds must have been spent on propaganda by poster display and on financing his short-lived journal. Mr. Tom Johnston, Lord Priy Seal in the Labour Government, said that from £30,000 to £40,000 had been spent on the poster display alone. Mosley did not offer to disclose the source of his funds, and of course neither he nor his Fascist organisation will do so now, but he promptly hit back at Mr. Johnston by pointing out that the Labour Party was in the habit of sending out a special appeal to rich men for donations to its secret fund. (*Manchester Guardian*, April 28th, 1931.)

The way in which wealthy men subscribed to the Liberal and Tory funds is, of course, notorious, and Hitler and the other new political Messiahs who promised a clean sweep of old-gang methods have not shown any intention of getting rid of the method of collecting big funds from big business.

The Socialist Party of Australia

A SPLENDID ELECTION FIGHT

THE SOCIALIST PARTY OF GREAT BRITAIN

OBJECT.—The establishment of a system of society based upon the common ownership and democratic control of the means and instruments for producing and distributing wealth by and in the interest of the whole community.

DECLARATION OF PRINCIPLES

THE SOCIALIST PARTY of Great Britain HOLDS—

1. That society as at present constituted is based upon the ownership of the means of living (i.e., land, factories, railways, etc.) by the capitalist or master class, and the consequent enslavement of the working class, by whose labour alone wealth is produced.

2. That in society, therefore, there is an antagonism of interests, manifesting itself as a class struggle, between those who possess but do not produce, and those who produce but do not possess.

3. That this antagonism can be abolished only by the emancipation of the working class from the domination of the master class, by the conversion into the common property of society of the means of production and distribution, and their democratic control by the whole people.

4. That as in the order of social evolution the working class is the last class to achieve its freedom, the emancipation of the working class will involve the emancipation of all mankind without distinction of race or sex.

5. That this emancipation must be the work of the working class itself.

6. That as the machinery of government, including the armed forces of the nation, exists only to conserve the monopoly by the capitalist class of the wealth taken from the workers, the working class must organise consciously and politically for the conquest of the powers of government, national and local, in order that this machinery, including these forces, may be converted from an instrument of oppression into the agent of emancipation and the overthrow of privilege, aristocratic and plutocratic.

7. That as all political parties are but the expression of class interests, and as the interest of the working class is diametrically opposed to the interests of all sections of the master class, the party seeking working-class emancipation must be hostile to every other party.

8. THE SOCIALIST PARTY of Great Britain, therefore, enters the field of political action determined to wage war against all other political parties, whether alleged labour or avowedly capitalist, and calls upon the members of the working class of this country to muster under its banner to the end that a speedy termination may be wrought to the system which deprives them of the fruits of their labour, and that poverty may give place to comfort, privilege to equality, and slavery to freedom.

Those agreeing with the above principles and desiring enrolment in the Party should apply for membership form to secretary of nearest branch or at Head Office.

Our companion party in Australia contested the Melbourne Ports constituency in the recent elections to the Australian Parliament (House of Representatives). The candidate was Comrade W. J. Clarke, Honorary Secretary of the Socialist Party of Australia, but of course the electors were not asked to vote for the man but for the principles of the Party. The opposing candidates were two in number, the Labour Party candidate and the candidate of the United Australia Party. Simultaneously with the holding of the elections to the House of Representatives there were in progress elections to fill half the seats in the Senate (Australia's equivalent of the House of Lords, but elected). In consequence of this, the Socialist candidate also came into conflict with a Communist candidate for the Senate, whose constituency included the Melbourne Ports area. The result of the election was instructive in many ways. First, it showed that while the amount of support for Socialism is small it is by no means negligible. The Labour candidate won the seat with 27,081 votes, followed by the United Australia Party candidate with 12,173 and by the Socialist with 3,872. That there are 3,872 prepared to vote for Socialism and against capitalist and reformist candidates is highly encouraging.

What is more the Socialist vote was con-

siderably higher than the vote cast for the Communist candidate for the Senate in the same constituency. The Socialist vote, as stated, was 3,872, compared with a Communist vote of 2,359. Not only was the total Socialist vote higher than the Communist vote but it was higher in every one of the 12 sub-divisions into which the total was divided.

As for the campaign we cannot do better than quote from the report we have received from the Australian Party.

"From the outset we were hampered by a campaign of silence, and whatever publicity we obtained in the press was grudgingly given. Like tactics were adopted by our opponents; the Labour candidate never once mentioned the name of our candidate or the Party. As he had been posing as a "Socialist" for years this attitude of his can be readily understood.

"Another drawback was the brevity of the campaign. Starting with an open air meeting at Albert Park on August 24th, we ended with an open air meeting in the same place on September 14th, the night prior to election day. Two large indoor meetings were held in the Port Mel-

bourne Town Hall, right in the heart of the electorate. Another not so well attended indoor meeting, was held in the Mechanics' Hall at Williamstown, while a fine, attentive and well

attended meeting was held at the Clarendon Single Unemployed Men's Group. Open air meetings were held in all the sub-divisions of the electorate. . . .

"With rare exceptions our meetings were surprisingly well attended and the Party's propaganda was received with marked approval by the majority of those present. Objections were raised by supporters of the Communist Party and the Labour Party in some instances; but no member or supporter of these parties would take our platform to state their opposition to our policy when invited to do so by our speakers.

"The best meeting of all was held in the open at Albert Park on September 14th the night before polling day. At this meeting Mr. Laurence, the United Australia Party candidate, took our stump in answer to a challenge by one of our speakers. There were nearly 700 people present. The meeting

was lively but orderly, and lasted until after 11 p.m. . . ."

"Right throughout the campaign we stressed our object and principles and the whole burden of our appeal to the electors was, 'If you do not want Socialism, we do not want your vote,' an attitude which met with hostility from the Communists whose candidates were running on the usual programme of immediate demands."

Under Australian electoral law the deposit, of £25, was forfeit because the Socialist vote was less than one-fifth of the vote of the winning candidate. From a propaganda point of view the campaign was highly successful and has served to put the Socialist Party definitely on the map, while at the same time given encouragement to the members.

Further information is that the Sydney branch of the Party proposes to run a candidate in the New South Wales State elections, where no election deposit at all is required.

We Debate with the Fascists

The following is a summarized report of a debate that took place at Mawney Road Schools, Romford, on March 23rd, between E. Hardy, representing the S.P.G.B., and Mr. Probyn, representing the British Union of Fascists. The subject was "Fascism or Socialism." The chair was taken by Mr. Wilson, Editor of the *Romford Times*.

Case for the Socialist Party

Comrade Hardy opened the debate by pointing out that he was speaking as the representative of the S.P.G.B., and it followed as a matter of course that he was not prepared to defend the principles or policy of any other organisation than the one he represented. It would be necessary in order to consider the case for Socialism and the case for Fascism first of all to take a glance at the existing condition of things, to which Socialism and Fascism are offered as alternatives. The existing system is capitalism. Its essential feature is that the means of production and distribution are owned and controlled not by society as a whole but by a section, the capitalists. Less than one-quarter of the population own between them nearly 90 per cent. of the accumulated property of all kinds. Facing them is the working class which lives by the sale of labour-power to the capitalists. The one class lives by the ownership of property and is a non-wealth producing class. The other class lives by selling its mental and physical energies for wages or salary, based roughly on the cost of living of the various groups of workers.

It was necessary at this stage to remove any misconception about the term working-class. It is not used by Socialists in the popular loose way to

describe industrial workers only, but in a precise way to cover all who have to sell their labour-power as their normal means of living. The term applies, therefore, to clerical workers, Government employees, technical workers, salaried managers and so on, making up in all about 85 per cent. of the population.

The consequences of capitalism are too well known to require long description. First there is poverty in the working-class face to face with extremes of wealth in the capitalist class. Then there is unemployment, a normal feature of capitalism throughout its history. Then there are crises which periodically aggravate the normal evils of capitalism. Capitalists permit the workers to produce wealth only if they anticipate being able to sell at a profit. If this anticipation is absent then the capitalists can and do curtail production, close down the factories, etc., and throw millions out of work. Next there is class hatred, an inevitable consequence of the division of society into an owning and non-owning class. Lastly there is war. When the capitalists fear that foreign rivals are endangering their investments abroad, or are threatening markets, trade routes, etc., they set the armed forces in motion when bluff and threats have failed.

These are the consequences of capitalism and they are not recent phenomena as is sometimes supposed, but have existed since the beginning of capitalism.

The remedy is Socialism. Consequently the S.P.G.B. stands for Socialism alone and not for any other isms—"Socialism, the whole of Socialism, nothing but Socialism." Socialism

means a system of society in which the means of production and distribution are owned and controlled by society as a whole and in which the members of society co-operate in the production of wealth and have access to the things they have produced. There will be no longer an owning class which does not produce and a producing class which does not own. Socialism will end the evils produced by capitalism. Poverty, the contrast of rich and poor, will be ended. The wages system under which the members of one class sell labour-power to the members of another will likewise be ended and with it will go the unemployment problem. Production will no longer be under the control of a class seeking profit and able to curtail production when the anticipation of profit is absent. Consequently Socialism will end crises. It will likewise end class-hatred and war.

Now that the attitude of the S.P.G.B. towards capitalism had been explained it was necessary to explain where Fascism stands. Because of the evils which flow from capitalism there is always discontent, sometimes increasing, sometimes subsiding. Reformist political parties therefore come into existence rallying the discontented round them by promising to deal with particular evils and using the discontent as a means of raising their particular party to office and the sweets of office. The reformist parties are all bound to fail because they leave untouched the private property basis of capitalism.

The B.U.F. takes its place among the organisations seeking to reform capitalism while leaving its basis intact. The B.U.F. differs from the older reformist parties in two main respects. The first is that while these talked much of their programme of social and economic reforms and little of methods, Sir Oswald Mosley concentrated all his attention on methods and little on ends. Thus two articles by him (*Daily Mirror*, March 11th, and *Daily Mail* March 4th) contained much about reforming Parliament and nothing about what he intends to do if ever in power. The second difference is that the older reformists were democratic while the B.U.F. attacks democratic methods. This is due to the fact that the workers in many countries have seen capitalism administered by democratic reformist parties, and in their disgust at the discovery that capitalism administered by Labour and similar parties is no better than it was before, many of them have turned to an anti-democratic reformist party.

The British Union of Fascists has a number of points in its programme, but the outstanding characteristic is that although they claimed originality none of it is new. The whole has been taken over from other reformist parties. Even the name "Fascio" was in use as the name of an Italian Labour paper thirty or forty years ago and it was probably there that Mussolini

picked it up. Regarding the Fascist doctrine of leadership, this again is old. Ever since its formation the S.P.G.B. has been doing its best to combat the leadership idea among the workers. What is needed is not leaders, but Socialists who know what they want and how to get it.

But let us examine Mosley's credentials as a leader. In the first place there are two people who have regarded him as a genius—Lord Rothermere and Mr. Ben Tillet. That alone is almost enough to damn him. Mr. Tillet was once an admirer of Horatio Bottomley, and Lord Rothermere's admiration of Mosley places him alongside others whom Lord Rothermere has recently described as geniuses—Hindenburg, Hitler and the ex-Crown Prince of Germany, the man who used to be held up to ridicule as a figure of fun in the *Daily Mail*, under the name of Little Willy. Since 1918 Mosley has belonged to a number of parties. He was led up the garden first by Lloyd George and the leaders of the Conservative Party. Then he stood as independent, then he was taken in by J. R. MacDonald and Maxton. Then he formed the New Party and then the B.U.F. Here you had a leader who could be taken in by a whole succession of political quacks. Look at it from another point of view. The Fascist idea of leadership implied the ability to choose men to act as his lieutenants. Before he formed the New Party Mosley got 17 M.P.s and the late A. J. Cook, the miners' leader, to sign his manifesto. Ten of them deserted before the Party was formed and all but two or three deserted afterwards.

This ended the first speech for the S.P.G.B.

The Case for the British Union of Fascists

Mr. Probyn said that as usual he found nothing new in the Socialist case. He had been a Socialist for ten years and had even flirted with the S.P.G.B. However, he would leave the question of Socialism until his second speech and would first put the case for Fascism.

The remarks made by his opponent relating to Sir Oswald Mosley contained nothing new. He had heard them many times before. With regard to the alleged arrogance of Sir Oswald Mosley he hoped to see every single person in Great Britain just as arrogant. The fact that he had been backed by Rothermere and Ben Tillet, both of whom Fascists detested, was no argument against Fascism. They were not going to quarrel with anyone who gave them publicity.

The Fascists had never claimed there was anything new in their programme. What they did was to take all that was best in the other programmes. Is it going to be said that a sewing machine is bad because it is borrowed from abroad?

There were many points of similarity between himself and his opponent. The present system was rotten and a system that did not guarantee a full

life to all must go. Fascism does not believe in class distinctions although recognising that class struggle exists. It asks people to remember first of all that they are British people, born in this country, and entitled to a full and free life. The present organisation of capitalism for private profit had as its roof the international organisation of finance. It was international finance that exhibited solidarity and with which Fascism quarrelled. The so-called international solidarity of labour was a myth. Great Britain was our own country for which many of us had fought, believing that we were fighting for a new world as promised by the Welsh wizard, Lloyd George. But we found we were wrong, it was a delusion and we were not going to fight for it any longer. That is the be all and end all of it. Democracy was a farce and a failure. It has never yet accomplished anything and never will. Any government given power to govern should do so for all and not for sections, as at present.

Socialism asks us to wait until world conditions are ready for a change, but that will be over 500 years hence. We are not going to wait until every Hottentot has a bicycle. Fascism believes in getting down to earth and making the best of the material we have now.

Unemployment, slums and so forth are on the increase and have been existing for generations. We are trying to build up a new nation while some people are waiting for the New Jerusalem. We want our pie now. The problem of production has been solved, but not that of distribution. The present system has got into hands of international bankers who are the real power in the world to-day—Baldwin and his like are only puppets. Fascism is going to break this stranglehold in Great Britain anyhow.

Ownership does not matter. What really matters is what is done with the thing owned. A revolver lying on the shelf at home is harmless, but used in the street to shoot people is dangerous. That is where the control must be exercised. The ownership of the means of production has to be controlled in the national interest and not from Whitehall but by the whole people.

There are three classes in society to-day: employers, employees and consumers. Fascism proposes that each shall be represented on a board of management in the interest of the community—Be British is what counts first. Produce to the fullest capacity in order that consumers can have ample. Fascism prohibits the importation of what we can produce ourselves. We are brought up to believe that Great Britain cannot support itself—it is a psychology taught by our governors who want cheap foreign goods and to export to foreign markets. Industries are transferred abroad (as in the case of jute) and workers here put out of work by those who own the industries. Money

made in cotton here is taken to China and used to develop production that competes against Lancashire. The people who do this are the international financiers. Hence the necessity for the national question first.

It is said people in Great Britain will never stand a dictatorship, but there is now a dictator in every street. What are landlords, managers, foremen, etc., but dictators? Fascism is striking at the heart of capitalist dictatorship in England. It is true that it is not proved that England can be self-supporting, but all Fascists say is that there is plenty of land that can be put under cultivation. They are going to help the farmer to take an active interest in the land but that he is not going to make large surplus profit out of it. They quite agree that work is good for all people.

We are ruthless and we are going to attack all vested interests of bankers and present trade unions, etc. Under Fascism franchise will be on an occupational basis and the representative will be a member of the trade that supports him, and so will be able to talk intelligently on industrial questions. Fascists believe in private enterprise. Every man and woman should own a stake in the country but no one will be allowed to exploit his ownership. The State will be absolutely supreme. Community interest will be paramount and no one will be allowed to do anything against the interest of others.

The aim of Fascism is to develop production to its utmost capacity and so organise affairs that production and consumption balance.

(To be continued.)

The 31st Annual PARTY CONFERENCE

will be held on

Friday and Saturday, April 19th and 20th

at

FAIRFAX HALL,
STANHOPE GARDENS, HARRINGAY, N.
(Id. Bus or Tram from Finsbury Park Underground Station)
Commence at 10 a.m. OPEN TO ALL

The Annual PARTY RE-UNION

will take place in the above Hall on

Good Friday, April 19th, at 7 30 p.m.

Door open 7 p.m.

Tickets from any Branch Secretary, or from any Member
of the Social Committee at Head Office,
Price 1/- each

(Enclose 1d. Postage with each order)

The Socialist Party: its Principles and Policy

Price 2d. (post free 2½d.)

Send your orders to the Literature Secretary, 42, Great
Dover Street, London, S.E.1

The Socialist Forum

DO THE BOLSHEVISTS TEACH SOCIALISM?

During recent months several correspondents have asked about the educational work carried on by the Bolshevik Government and Party in Russia. Admitting that the social system in Russia is capitalistic and is not being transformed into Socialism as the Russian Government claims, nevertheless, is it not true, these correspondents ask, that great propaganda work for Socialism is being carried on?

In reply, let us first record certain things that are not disputed. It is agreed that illiteracy in Russia is being stamped out, thus bringing Russia into line with the more advanced capitalist countries. This is an indispensable preliminary to Socialist propaganda and organisation, and is all to the good.

Even here, however, the progress, apparently, is less than has been represented if we are to give any weight to Stalin's statement to the All-Russia Congress in the autumn of 1934, that the peasants are in a condition of "darkness and ignorance" (quoted by Mr. Hamilton Fyfe, *Daily Herald*, January 16th, 1935).

Second, there has undoubtedly been a vast outpouring of books, pamphlets and periodicals devoted to economic and political problems, and to the writings of Marx, Engels, and other pioneers of Socialism. This, however, owing to the way in which it is done, is by no means an unmixed blessing, although it must, to some extent, aid the growth of a future Socialist movement. The objection to it is that it has been wholly subordinated to the requirements of the ruling clique in Russia. As the political, industrial and international problems of growing capitalism have arisen in Russia, the Government has used and perverted Socialist theories and writings for its own purposes. Like any government of Labour reformists, the Bolsheviks have described State capitalism as Socialism, and capitalist sweating practices as "Socialist competition," and in order to serve their own real or supposed ends they have flooded the world with pseudo-Socialist propaganda and debauched the working class movement with dishonest vote-catching tricks, from the advocacy of capitalist free trade and nationalisation, to the electoral support of Ramsay MacDonald and his former colleagues.

We are entitled to judge the work of the Bolshevik Government in the field of education and propaganda by what we see of their efforts in this country. When we see the kind of Bolshevik policies, books and pamphlets, produced or inspired in Russia and imposed on the Communist Parties outside Russia, we may well doubt whether the

men who produced some of them are competent to teach Russian youth anything about Socialism. Not for one hundred years has the English working class movement produced such childish, clumsy, illogical, short-sighted and generally incompetent work as that of the British Communist Party's Russian masters.

Inside Russia itself the Russian Government has done great harm in another way. The elementary pre-requisite of real Socialist propaganda and organisation, i.e., the freedom to organise, discuss and carry on propaganda, have been rigidly suppressed. Views believed to be contrary to the interests of the ruling clique have been forbidden the opportunity of being heard, opposition literature and organisation have been banned. That has been the work of the Bolshevik Government and Party, and it goes far to destroy the value of the indirect assistance they have given to Socialist propaganda by abolishing illiteracy and publishing Marxian, etc., works.

Without sharing Trotsky's views in general, we can endorse his statement about Socialist propaganda in Russia:—

There was hardly ever in this world at any time, or anywhere, such difficulty for a genuine Marxist trend to carry on its work, in the technical sense, as there is for us at present in the Soviet Union.
(*New York Militant*, July 30th, 1932.)

The difficulty Trotsky referred to was the Government's unremitting persecution of opposition groups in and out of the Bolshevik Party.

ED. COMM.

* * * * *

KEIR HARDIE AND THE WORLD WAR.

In the August, 1928, issue of THE SOCIALIST STANDARD we replied to a statement made by the Scottish *Forward*, that it was nonsense to say that the late Keir Hardie supported British capitalist interests in the Great War. Having provided unchallengeable evidence in support of our statement, we invited *Forward* to publish it. Instead, the editor took refuge in silence. Recently a member of the S.P.G.B., who formerly belonged to the I.L.P., took up this and other questions with the *New Leader*. The Editor, Mr. Fenner Brockway, refused publication on the grounds set out in the following letter, addressed from the *New Leader* office on October 23rd, 1934:—

Dear Mr. Allen,

I received your letter on Keir Hardie, but I have not published it because the *New Leader* is a propagandist newspaper, and is not intended for controversy. When misstatements of fact appear in our columns we are prepared to correct them, but I do not regard your letter as within this category.

The criticism of Keir Hardie on the ground that he did not oppose the Great War always impresses me as mean and ungenerous. Those of us who were associated with Hardie know how, whilst he retained his physical and mental strength, he opposed the War in

the most uncompromising way. If during the last few months of his life his public expressions changed to some degree, I think we must regard this as the mental effect of the decline in his physical health.

Yours faithfully,
A. FENNER BROCKWAY,
Editor.

The important point about Keir Hardie's support of the War is that it was not, as Mr. Brockway implies, during the last few months of his life, but immediately the War broke out. It was, for example, in the *Merthyr Pioneer* of November 27th, 1914, that Mr. Hardie was boasting that a meeting of his had brought in more recruits for the army than the meetings of his Liberal opponent, the candidate for the division.

This was pointed out to Mr. Brockway, but he still refused to publish the truth about it in the *New Leader*.
ED. COMM.

SOCIALISTS AND RUSSIA.

The following is typical of several letters from readers:—

Dear Sir,

While in general agreement with your analysis of the existing economic and political situation, I am at a loss to understand your attitude towards the Russian Government. As it appears to me, the main purpose of all governments, whether democratic or dictatorial, is the powers of coercion they are able to wield, and the extent to which these coercive powers are exercised depends on the opposition met with by the governing authorities.

In previous issues you have stressed the fact that Socialism cannot be achieved in any country without a highly-developed industrial system, and, as this can only be achieved by the exploitation of labour power and natural resources, the Russians, by their policy of industrialisation, would seem to be on the proper path, although still a long way from the Socialist goal.

I am,
Yours fraternally,
H. EVITT.

Reply.

The argument, as we understand it, boils down to this. Industrial development must take place before it will be possible for Socialism to be achieved. The Russian Government is fostering industrial development. Therefore the Russian Government should be supported by Socialists.

The argument can be tested by applying it to other governments. The Turkish dictatorship, the Japanese Government, the American Government (and many other governments) are directly fostering industrial development in State or State-aided schemes. Ought Socialists, therefore, to support all these governments?

The fundamental weakness in the argument is that the Socialist Movement is inseparable from the class struggle, which is inseparable from capitalism. Those who administer capitalism do not create and cannot destroy the class struggle. They can only do one of two things—(a) give up the administration of capitalism, which means give up governing, or (b) maintain capitalism, which means taking the capitalist side in the struggle. In other words, those who administer

capitalism must inevitably find themselves divorced from the working class and working class movements.

That is borne out by every attempt at "Labour" government and by the Bolshevik administration.

The Socialist movement must spring from the workers, and must oppose the capitalists and those who administer capitalism on their behalf.

Apart from this, there are other factors. It is highly debatable whether, in the long run, Bolshevik rule will be compatible with the kind of industrial development Russian capitalism needs and will secure.
ED. COMM.

THE DOUGLASITES AND SOCIALISM.

A statement in our February issue that the Douglasites in this country avoid public debate with Socialists has been disputed by several Douglasite readers, one of whom tells us that "from personal knowledge I know that that statement is untrue." This correspondent asked us to substantiate the statement.

The following letter will show that at least one of the several Douglasite organisations avoids public debate with Socialists. Members of the S.P.G.B. tell us of a similar attitude on the part of other Douglas movements.

KIBBO KIFT.

The Green Shirt Movement for Social Credit.
National Headquarters, 35, Old Jewry, London, E.C.2.
Douglas Wright, Esq., 9th July, 1933.
32, Avondale Road, S.E.15.

Dear Sir,

Your letter to Mr. F. S. Jackson of the 19th ulto. has been passed to me for a decision on the matter of debating with the group you suggest.

I have to inform you, however, that it is not our general practice to debate the subject of Douglas Social Credit, and particularly we do not go elsewhere to debate it. A challenge to put our case at headquarters is invariably accepted, but our general attitude is that the time for debating has long since ended and that the establishment of Social Credit is our interest.

Yours faithfully,
IAN A. ROSS,

For the Green Shirt Movement.

Another correspondent writes to tell us that the "press and other agencies over which the Financial Interests have control" completely boycott Douglas propaganda.

This correspondent evidently bases his view on a limited acquaintance with the press. There was a time when Major Douglas had difficulty in getting publicity for his views, largely, no doubt, because they were not regarded seriously, but also to some extent because banking and other interests can and do exercise a considerable pressure on newspapers and would object to publicity being given to anti-banker propaganda. At all times, however, Major Douglas has had the use of journals in which his views were propagated, and he has never been up against the lack of funds to publish journals which always hampers the

Socialist Party of Great Britain. Furthermore, in recent years other journals have opened their columns to Douglasite propaganda or at least to discussion about it in correspondence. Among the daily papers which have done so are the *Herald*, *News Chronicle*, *The Times*, *Manchester Guardian*. Among the weeklies are *Forward*, *Reynolds's Illustrated*, *New Statesman* and *Listener*.

And this brings us to our next point. With rare exceptions, and that in respect of only one or two of the above-mentioned journals, they are absolutely closed to the propaganda of the S.P.G.B., either general propaganda or the Socialist criticism of Major Douglas. In recent months the *Daily Herald*, *Forward*, and *Reynolds's* have declined to publish letters putting the Socialist case against Douglasism although prepared to give ample space to Douglasite propaganda.
ED. COMM.

The Industrial Revolution

About 1760—1832

(Lecture by Com. STEWART, November 11th, 1934.)

A. ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT.

England led because: (1) Coal and iron together and abundant; (2) had command of seas; (3) wars on Continent hindered rivals. Cleavage between town and country.

- Towns.** Rapid influx; and increase of population. Intense exploitation. Enormously increased division of labour. Insecurity. *Machinery and inventions.* (Cross-fertilisation in industry.) 1733 Fly-shuttle. 1760 Coal in blast furnaces. 1766 Spinning-jenny. 1776 Watts' steam pump. 1779 Crompton's mule. 1785 Steam power loom. Boom in cotton production. Growth of chemical manufactures—first for fertilisers. 1807 First public gas-lighting in London.
- Country.** Three-field system gave way to rotation of crops. Breeding livestock became an industry. Growth of large-scale farming based on wage-labour. *Enclosure of Common lands.* This and destruction of home textile industry made peasants into wage-workers. No outdoor relief till 1792. Settlement laws. 1795 Speenhamland decision.
- Communications.** Improvement necessary because of speed of production and mobility of capital and labour. Canals—roads—railways. Steamships from 1812. Passenger railways from 1825. Penny Post 1840. Telegraph 1844. Telephone 1876.

B. LEGISLATION.

Financial crisis at beginning of 19th century. 1798 Income tax. 1797-1819 No cash payments by Bank of England. 1800 Combination Laws not enforced against employers. 1812 and 1819 Factory Acts; but no inspection. 1815 Corn Laws; ensured high income to landowners. 1819 Six Acts; violent repression of discontent. 1825 Repeal of Combination Laws. 1832 Reform Act. 1846 Repeal of Corn Laws; two triumphs of industrialists over landed aristocracy. 1848 Ten Hour Act; revenge of landowners. (Various Truck Acts, only gradually enforced.)

C. MEN AND IDEAS.

- Conservative.** Complacency of Castlereagh, Wilberforce, Melbourne, etc. "Everything for the best." Christianity a useful weapon against revolt. Panic at French Revolution.
- Radical.** Germs of Socialism in humanitarian philosophy. *Paine*: Political reform, anti-clericalism. *Cobbett*: Anti-Corn Laws, Reform Bill. *Place*: Universal suffrage and education, repeal of Corn Laws, utilitarianism, enlightened self-interest. *Owen*:

Education, Communism, marriage reform, atheism, Trade Unionism, Co-operation. *Lovett*: Reform Bill, Chartism.

D. STRUGGLE AND ORGANISATION.

- Economic.** 1811 Machine wrecking. 1817 Blanketeers. 1818 Spinners' strike. 1819 Peterloo. Trade Unions illegal until 1825—secret benefit societies. 1830 National Association of Labour. 1834 Grand National Consolidated Union (Owen). Reaction after Reform Bill helped Unions. (Co-operative Societies at first part of unions, but diverged and soon lost Owenite ideals. T.U. movement bitterly opposed and repressed, but developed steadily.)

- Political.** Reform Bill and Anti-Corn Law agitation supported by masses of workers; helped one section of exploiting class against another. Discontent side-tracked. Disappointment with provisions of Reform Bill brought *Chartism*.

The function of the Industrial Revolution was the rapid and entire completion of a process begun in the 16th century: The division of society into two classes; the transformation of the mass of the population into wage-slaves; the fullest possible development of production for profit.

BOOKS TO READ:

- Beard*: "Industrial Revolution."
de Gibbins: "Industrial History of England."
Hammond: "Skilled Labourer." "Town Labourer."
"Village Labourer."
Usher: "History of Mechanical Inventions."
Riazanov: "Annotated Edition of Communist Manifesto."
Engels: "Condition of the Working Class in England in 1844." "Socialism—Utopian and Scientific."
Marx: "Capital," I, ch. x ("Working Day"); ch. xv ("Machinery and Modern Invention").

HEAD OFFICE

Meetings will be held on Sunday evenings at 8.30 p.m.

April 7th	WILMOT	"Materialism"
" 14th	REGINALD	"War"

BROMLEY PUBLIC HALL

A meeting will be held on Sunday, 7th April, at 8 p.m.

Subject	Speaker
"The Threat of Fascism and War"	Wilmot

LEYTON

A SOCIAL

will take place

on Saturday, April 27th at 8 p.m.

at

Forest Grange, 5 Upper Walthamstow Road

ADMISSION FREE

TOOTING

A lecture will be given at the Wimbledon Labour Hall, Sunday, April 14th, at 8.30 p.m.

Subject	Speaker
"Hitler and the Versailles Treaty"	N. Isbitsky

Open Air Meetings

Sundays:

		April 7th	14th	21st	28th
Regents Park	11.30 a.m.	Ross	Ambridge	Rubins	Isbitsky
Clapham Common	3 p.m.	Banks	Walker	Banks	Ross
Avenue Road, Clock Tower, Lewisham	7.30 p.m.	Cash	Reginald	Ambridge	Banks
West Green Corner	8 p.m.	Walker	Rubins	Lestor	Ambridge
Clapton Square (near Hackney Baths)	8 p.m.	Reginald	Ross	Waters	Lestor
Victoria Park	8 p.m.	Goldstein	Godfrey	Goldberg	Wilmot
Queens Road, Bayswater (near Whiteley's)	8 p.m.	—	—	—	Goldberg
Brook Road, Hackney	8 p.m.	—	—	—	—

Mondays:

Ridley Road, Dalston, E.8 8 p.m.

Tuesdays:

Clissold Corner, Albion Road, N.16 8 p.m.

Wednesdays:

Windsor Road, Forest Gate, E. 8 p.m. Hackney Town Hall 8 p.m.

Thursdays:

Ridley Road, Dalston, E.8. 8 p.m. "Salmon and Ball," Bethnal Green, E. 8 p.m.

Saturdays:

London Road, Wembley 7.30 p.m.

BRANCH DIRECTORY

BATTERSEA.—Sec., 2, Hanbury Road, S.W.11. Branch meets Thursday, 8.30 p.m., at The Waiting Room, Latchmere Baths, entrance in Burns Road.

BIRMINGHAM.—Sec., E. Jesper, 38, Rollason Road, Erdington. Branch meets Jeans Café, Newton Street. First Wednesday in month at 8 p.m.

BLOOMSBURY.—Branch meets every Monday at 7.30 p.m., at A.E.U. Hall, 39, Doughty Street, W.C. (Near Grays Inn, Road.) Sec., Miss B. Foster, 11, Regent Square, W.C.1.

CENTRAL.—Membership obtained only through the Ex. Committee. Applications to General Sec.

CHISWICK.—(See West London).

DAGENHAM.—Branch meets alternate Mondays (from 4th February, at 8 p.m., Pettits' Farm, Heathway. Sec. H. Berry, 5, Cannington Road, Dagenham, Essex.

ECCELES.—Branch meets 1st and 3rd Mondays in month at Railway Temperance Room, Four Bridges, Wellington Road, 7.30 p.m. Lecture and discussion, 8.45. Non-members invited. Secretary, Mrs. F. LEA, 5, Gaskell Road, Eccles, Lancs.

EDINBURGH.—Communications to Sec., D. Lamond, at 15, Barclay Place.

GLASGOW.—Branch meets 2nd and 4th Mondays in month, 8 p.m., at 98 Naburn Street, Glasgow, C.5. Communications to J. Higgins, 18, Balgair Street, Glasgow.

HACKNEY.—Branch meets Friday, 7.30 p.m., at Old Gravel Pit Hall, Vallette Street, E.9. Lecture after each meeting. Communication to Sec., E. Chalkley, 21, Bridge Street, E.9.

ILFORD.—Branch meets Mondays at 8 p.m. at 142, Richmond Road. Discussion after Branch business. Communications to Sec., at above address.

ISLINGTON.—All communications to F. W., 92, Wellington Road, Holloway, N.2. Branch meets on Fridays at 8 to 10.30 p.m., at Room 4, Co-operative Hall, 129, Seven Sisters Road, N.

LEYTON.—Communications to Sec., Dick Jacobs, 12, Clifford Rd., Walthamstow, E.17. Branch meets Thursday, 8 p.m., at Trades Hall, Grove House, High Road, Leyton.

LEWISHAM.—Branch meets Thursdays, at 8 p.m., at The Anchor Club Room, Lewisham Road. Communications to H. A. Russell, 73, Kimberley Road, Nunhead, S.E.16.

MANCHESTER.—Branch meets fortnightly (Mondays) as from 14 Jan., at Craigwell Restaurant, Peter Street (entrance in South Street). Sec., B. A. Lee, 19, Emery Avenue, Chorlton, Manchester.

PADDINGTON.—Branch meeting held on 2nd Friday, and lecture with discussion on 4th Friday in each month, 8 p.m., in the guild room over "Co-op. Stores," 447, Harrow Road, W.10. Literature Sec., W. Veal, 73, Wornington Road, W.10.

ROMFORD.—Branch meets alternate Tuesdays at 8 p.m. commencing February 5th (open to public) at N.U.R. Club, Albert Road. Business followed by Lecture and discussion. Secy. P. Golding, "Basra," Boscombe Ave., Hornchurch.

SHEFFIELD.—Sec., G. H. Southey, 83, Wallace Road, Sheffield, 3. Branch meets alternate Mondays, 7.30 p.m. at Room 2, A.E.U. Institute, Stanley Street.

SOUTHEND-ON-SEA.—Branch meets 1st and 3rd Wednesday in the month, at 8 p.m. at 8, Hermitage Road, Westcliff. Discussion after branch business. Non-members invited. Communications to Sec. at above address.

SOUTHWARK.—Branch meets Fridays at 8 p.m., 43, Great Dover St., S.E.1. Communications to Sec., at above address.

STEPNEY.—Sec., S. Goldstein, 18, Irene House, Flower & Dene Street, Stepney, E.1. Branch meets on Fridays, at 8 p.m., at Working Lads Institute (nr. Whitechapel Station).

TOOTING.—Branch meets 1st Sunday in the month, at 12 o'clock at "The Springfield Social Club," 590, Garrett Lane, S.W.17 (Opposite Burntwood Lane).

TOTTENHAM.—Branch meets 1st and 3rd Fridays in the month, 7, Bruce Grove, Room 2. Discussion after branch business. Public invited. Communications to C. Godfrey, 49, Napier Road, Tottenham, N.17.

WEST HAM.—Sec., G. J. Giles, 22, Colegrave Road, Stratford, E. Branch meets Whitehall School, Parliament Place, Forest Gate, every Thursday at 8 p.m.

WEST LONDON (Chiswick).—Branch meets Fridays, 8 p.m., at Chiswick Club, over 376, High Road, Chiswick, W.4. Communications to Sec., C. Curtis, 62, Parkstead Road, Putney, S.W.15.

WEMBLEY.—Communications to H. G. Holt, 28, Charterhouse Avenue, Wembley, Middlesex. Branch meets every Friday at 8 p.m., at Cafe-Restaurant, over 170, High Road, Wembley. Discussion after branch business.

WOOD GREEN.—Communications to Sec. at 44, Boreham Road, Wood Green, N.23. Branch meets 2nd and 4th Wednesday in month at 8.30 p.m., Stirling House, Stuart Crescent.

THE SOCIALIST STANDARD

The Official Organ of **THE SOCIALIST PARTY** of Great Britain.

No. 369. Vol. 31]

London, May, 1935

[Monthly, Twopence

*The Pomp .
and Show of
Jubilees are
trappings to
hide the . .
hands that .
wield the . .
Power.*

THE JUBILEE

The King celebrates this year the 25th anniversary of his ascension to the throne. On May 6th George V, by the grace of God (and the ruling class), King of Great Britain and the dominions beyond the seas, defender of the faith, Emperor of India, etc., etc., etc., will attend St. Paul's Cathedral, surrounded by Maharajahs, Dervish dancers, priests and cannibal kings from every outpost of the mighty Empire, to thank the Lord for having kept him on the throne for 25 years.

Let it be understood that we have no personal quarrel with George V and his family. They are merely figureheads on the capitalist ship, without any real control over political affairs. The Monarchy

is not the obstacle which prevents the establishment of Socialism. The monarchy is not kept at our expense, but at the expense of the capitalist class, in whose interests the monarchical institution conserves some of the old feudal glitter.

One of the reasons why the capitalists maintain these expensive ornaments is to dazzle the eyes of the workers

and encourage the use of patriotic sentiments for class ends. The whole paraphernalia of Royalty, the decorative functions of the King on State occasions, his purely formal powers, all this conceals from the workers the process of social development and change which has deposited the powers of government into the hands of the capitalist class through their control of the Parliamentary machine. The real kings are the employers, the buyers of labour-power.

In his capacity as a property-owner George V may be a person of influence, proportionate to his ownership of capital, but in his position as King of England he is only a legal appendage to State documents—a stamp and a signature. Be not deceived if you see photographs of the great ones of the land bending the knee and kissing the hand of our Sovereign Lord, King George. They make these showy obeisances partly because they are themselves deceived, but also to keep alive a traditional mummerly that helps them to paralyse the workers' minds. Should the occasion arise it would be a comparatively simple matter for capitalism to dispense with the services of one who is in fact but a glorified Civil Servant.

And who is this god they will all worship? It is not some mystical being who dwells on high and interferes with actions of men and women. The god who is to be thanked is the Great God Capital, whose tentacles are spread all over the earth, sucking wealth from the vitality of the working class for the enrichment, pleasure and aggrandisement of their masters.

The workers are to join in these celebrations. One day's holiday on full pay! A day's holiday for the workers to stand and cheer a class of

ON OTHER PAGES

	Page
Debate with Fascist...	131
Notes by the Way ...	134
Our Annual Conference	136
Hauling Down the Colours in Russia	136
A Defence of the Communist Party	139
Map and His Means ...	141
Meetings, Lectures and Discussions	130 & 144

people who have never been guilty of a real day's labour in their lives.

The Jubilee is a symbol. To the ruling class it symbolises wealth and power, pleasure and pomp. But it is another symbol to the workers. To them it symbolises years of misery and degradation, bloodshed, struggle and poverty. What have they to celebrate? Let us recount the manifold blessings of these twenty-five years which the workers of the world have enjoyed. During these twenty-five years millions of them laid down their lives on the battlefields of France and Flanders. Hundreds of thousands of women were made widows, millions of children were orphaned. The end of the war was thought by many workers to be the beginning of a new era. But no, poverty deepened and unemployment rose to record figures. This is all that the workers have to celebrate.

What if British capitalism is somewhat more advanced and less harsh in its effect than capitalism in some other countries? The capitalists here are expert in ruling with kid glove methods. They know how and when to grant a slight concession. It has long been their policy to lead the workers with promises and propaganda when this will serve, rather than drive the workers openly with the big stick. They know that a modern Government must avoid directly antagonising a majority of the population. What if the position of the workers in this country is slightly less degrading than in other capitalist countries. It is not a matter of great importance. What does matter is that the workers could be very much better off were it not for the private property institution of capitalism. Capitalism is the reason why no reforms can solve the workers' problems. Reforms cannot alter the existing relations between capitalist and worker. They are only detailed changes in matters of administration, and do not interfere with the basis of the production and distribution of wealth. From 1910 to 1935 hundreds more reforms have been placed on the Statute Book. Unemployment pay has largely replaced Poor Relief, the workers have earned high wages and low wages, Gold Standards have come and gone, and two Labour Governments have held office. The facts speak overwhelmingly against the reform parties. There has been no fundamental change in England during these twenty-five years of the reign of George V. The means of production and distribution were and are privately owned and controlled, one quarter of the population still own nine-tenths of property of all kinds; the product of industry is still privately owned. The capitalists still have the legal right to determine whether the means of production shall be operated, and what kind of goods shall be produced. They can still close down their factories; restrict or restart production as they think suitable for themselves. That is the rock on which all the reform parties split to pieces; the monopoly of the

means of life by the capitalist class. Twenty-five years of the reign of George V have not altered it.

Our attitude to all this is very simple. We want a standard of life and a degree of economic security that is impossible under capitalism. The only logical attitude for us to take up is to advocate the abolition of this system and the establishment of Socialism. This is the only policy in line with the interests of the working class. It is the policy we have consistently stood for during the reign of George V, and before him. We shall continue to uphold these principles. If there is anything at all for us to celebrate, it is the staunchness with which we have kept our banner flying for over thirty years. We have nothing else to celebrate except our poverty. The Jubilee is an opportunity for the capitalist class to celebrate their wealth and power. We shall not share in their celebrations. Instead of celebrating the Jubilee, it would be better for the workers to think over their problems and to find out why their masters have been getting richer and they have remained a subject class. The only thing necessary to solve these problems is the spread of Socialist knowledge to a point where they can see how much easier and better it would be to produce wealth in their own interests instead of producing it for the benefit of a superfluous class.

When the workers' eyes begin to open from their long sleep they will have no time for kings or priests. Nor will they concern themselves with the birthday of some Royal personage, or with the marriage of one to another. They will care nothing for Jubilees or Coronations. The only matter of concern to them would be freeing themselves from the chains of slavery, building a new society, and relegating kings, princes, capitalists, and all they represent to the place which belongs to them as institutions which have outlived their functions.

KAYE AND SCRUTATOR.

BLOOMSBURY

Lectures will be given on Monday evenings at A.E.U. Hall, 39, Doughty Street (Corner of Guildford Street), W.C.1. at 8.30 p.m.

May 13th	"Cash Box and Cassocks"	M. CAMERON.
" 20th	"Douglas Credit Scheme"	E. HARDY.
" 27th	"Racial Superstitions"	S. STEWART.

Admission free. All invited. Questions and Discussion.

"SOCIALISM"

48 pages, price 2d. (Post free 2½d.)

Send for a copy to the LITERATURE SECRETARY,
42 Great Dover Street, S.E.1

Debate with Fascist

(CONCLUDED)

Second Speech for the S.P.G.B.

In his second speech, Comrade Hardy pointed out that several ideas incorporated in the Fascist programme were suggested in the first place by the writings of Bishop Berkely 200 years ago. They were borrowed from Berkely by Mr. Strachey who helped Mosley to form the New Party. There is a close parallel between Mosley's admiration for the public works schemes of Mussolini's government and Berkely's writings, with, however, one interesting omission. Berkely advocated slave labour or "temporary servitude" for the unemployed. The resemblance to the Fascist Labour camps is obvious, but Mosley was no doubt squeamish about advocating slavery here. Sir Oswald Mosley spends much time denouncing the Parliamentary machine. Yet there is abundant evidence that when the majority really wants something Parliament can get measures passed, from first stage to last, in 24 hours.

Regarding Mosley's promise that under Fascism the electors would be allowed to vote periodically for and against the continuance of Mosley in office, would Mr. Probyn tell the audience when and where the rank and file of the B.U.F. had ever voted for and against Mosley as their leader? The B.U.F. undertook to "eliminate" party politics. Did this mean that there would be no debates allowed?

Mr. Probyn had stated that Fascists despise Lord Rothermere. That does not get over the obvious fact that the latter, as well as other big business interests, look with approval on the B.U.F. Rothermere does not give free publicity to the S.P.G.B. It was obvious, too, that Mosley has been able in the Fascist movement, as in the New Party, to obtain funds from wealthy men. He had himself spoken of big business sympathy with his movement.

Mr. Probyn had said that Fascists recognise the existence of the class struggle. The struggle is a fact arising from the existence of a propertied and a propertyless class. What is the Fascist remedy for this? Writing in the *Daily Mail* (March 23rd, 1934) Sir Oswald answered this question as follows: "Our object is to remove barriers of class by removing differences in dress." Fancy trying to remove the differences between millionaires and paupers by putting them in shirts of the same colour!

The Fascist speaker had claimed that governments should govern in the interest of the whole community. As, however, he had admitted that classes exist, how can a government govern in the interests of an exploiting and an exploited class simultaneously?

The Fascists say they cannot wait for Socialism; they want something now. All the reformist parties have used this as an argument against Socialism. Mussolini has been in power for 13 years and Mosley in his "Greater Britain" explains that Mussolini has so far failed to carry out a programme to solve the problems of capitalism. The B.U.F. could not get a majority at the coming General Election. Suppose for the sake of argument that they got one in 1941. On the experience of Mussolini's slowness it would be another 13 years, 1954, before they began to do something.

Comrade Hardy drew attention to the statement that governments are only tools of international financiers. How was it, then, that Mosley, after being an M.P. since 1918, took a post in the Labour Government in 1929? He must on that showing either be a tool or be very stupid. Regarding the Fascist promise that workers would vote occupationally, did this mean that the small number of employers and the large number of workers would have "equal" representation? If so, it would mean in effect disfranchising the workers.

It was absurd to say that J. R. MacDonald is or was a Socialist. The S.P.G.B. had always denounced him and his policy. Almost all the points in Sir Oswald Mosley's "Greater Britain" could be found in "Where Socialism Stands Today," written by a number of Labour Party "intellectuals," but neither of the two books has any bearing on Socialism. They are merely two statements of reforms of capitalism.

The Fascists, like the older reformist parties, talked about developing the Home market. Yet we have seen that when they get in power they carry on the struggle for foreign markets as before. Mussolini is pressing for the development of Italy's foreign trade in Africa and elsewhere, and Schacht, the economic dictator of Germany, is now reported to be planning subsidies for German exports in order to gain more markets.

The Fascists talked of helping the little man to resist the encroachments of big business. Mr. Probyn had said that Fascism will not attack private property. How, then, would the Fascist movement, with its big business backers, carry out their promises to the little man? Would they not break their pledges as had Fascists abroad?

Mr. Probyn. 2nd Speech.

The opposition has again made a wonderful speech and said nothing, and now I want to know what Socialism is. Opponent talked vaguely of common ownership and democratic control—of

capitalist owning everything and worker nothing. Dan Griffiths has compiled a book of definitions of Socialism drawn from reliable sources and he finds there are 263 different definitions. Some said it was a scientific attitude, others that it was a religious attitude. Some said it was just an attitude to life, others that it was a principle, and others again that it was an idea. One definition said it was sunlight opposed to darkness and so on.

It is generally agreed, however, that Karl Marx is the basis of all views and K. Marx appeals to all that is base in humanity. One favourite rant is the theory of surplus value, but many people, including Dr. Lindsay, have shown from Marx himself that the case is wrong. It is useless to declaim against Ramsay MacDonald and Dr. Lindsay. They represent the view of seven or eight million people. Professor Laski and Bertrand Russell have made similar criticisms of Marx's theories. Marxist economics cannot stand up to facts and they are just the meanderings of a disordered mind. The S.P.G.B. have not made much progress since 1904. The movement represented by MacDonald and Lindsay has made much more. Levelling down is the Socialist's idea. If a man has any property he is going to take it away. There have been some practical attempts at Socialism during the past 200 years and all have failed. The earlier attempts were made where there was plenty of undeveloped land and there was the best chance of success but everybody in the communities fell out. They could not work agreeably together. In the middle of last century Louis Blanc opened national workshops in France, but the only result was to land the people in debt and make them worse off. It has been the same since. The fact is human nature won't face Socialism. In Icaria community all people were the same, they wore the same clothes, etc. It all finished up by them starving as they were too infernally lazy to do anything.

These experiments, including Russia, have cost the lives of millions of people already.

With reference to Fascism abroad, Mussolini did not come into power to introduce the corporate state, but to get the people out of the morass they were in. The corporate state idea grew up later. We, here, start out with the idea. We don't care what happens abroad, we are concerned with what is happening here and dealing with it and not indulging in pipe dreams of Socialism. The British capitalists who exploit all over the world are worse than the foreigner, but there are also Socialist employers who exploit fellow Socialist workers.

My opponent has taken what I have said out of its context. What I said was that we would not seek foreign markets with the aid of the British army and navy. Wherever we go it will be on the basis of an equitable exchange.

We are not concerned with whether big firms or little men give us financial support. Anyone who wants to subsidise us can do so, I am willing to take away a cheque to-night. It does not matter where the money comes from. Fascism, however, is financed by its members and we are up against it, and have just as much difficulty in carrying on from a financial point of view as others.

We are opposed to economic advantages reaped by big firms. People who invest in multiple shops, owing to their capacity to buy in large quantities, get cheap goods from abroad—that is where little men fail. We are going to stop this and compel all to buy at same price. The Corporation will set a price for all. The small man will have his rights and his voice will be heard on the council.

My opponent asks when Sir Oswald Mosley ever takes a vote on the continuance of his leadership. He does not take a vote because we do not believe in taking a vote. Counting of noses is not an effective method, it includes the village idiots. The voice of members of the Fascist party is heard daily in shaping our policy and supporting the continued leadership of Sir Oswald Mosley. What we say to you is, here is a policy, are you prepared to accept it?

Final Speech for the S.P.G.B.

Comrade Hardy pointed out that he had described Socialism in his first speech, and the S.P.G.B.'s principles are published in every issue of the SOCIALIST STANDARD. Socialism is a system of society based on common ownership. Mr. Dan Griffiths' list of definitions contained all sorts of things but he believed it did not contain anything from the S.P.G.B. He was not here this evening to discuss Marx. He would, however, say this, that if disordered minds were being discussed, what about Hitler's Frankfurt Institute of biological mumbo-jumbo and witchcraft where records are kept of the racial history of a man's father and mother, grandfather and great-grandfather, and so on? Bertrand Russell, Laski, and Lindsay had been quoted as to the unsoundness of Marx's economics. Not one of these is an economist and not one of them is competent to express views on Marx's economic theories. Laski had admitted as much regarding himself.

Mr. Probyn, ignoring the fact that Socialism is a system of society, instanced a number of Utopian communities as if they had some bearing on Socialism. In one case he said that the Utopians were so keen about uniformity that they made all suits of clothes the same size. This is, of course, not Socialism, but capitalism gone mad, but talking of uniformity, what about the Fascist aim of compelling us all to wear shirts of the same colour?

Comrade Hardy repeated that he was there to

defend the principles and policy of the S.P.G.B., not the reformism of the Labour Party. Not only had Professor Hearnshaw recently written to *The Times* pointing out that State capitalism is not Socialism, but at least three of Mosley's sometime associates, the late Mr. A. J. Cook, Mr. W. J. Brown and Mr. Maxton, had declared that the Labour programme is not Socialism but State capitalism. If, however, Mr. Probyn denied the right of the S.P.G.B. to speak for Socialism, he might retort by denying the right of the B.U.F. to speak for Fascism. The late Miss Lynton-Orman, founder of an older Fascist party, had denied Sir Oswald membership as not being a fit and proper person to speak for Fascism.

Mr. Probyn had referred to the slow progress of the S.P.G.B. We had had much of our time taken up combating the errors of all the political parties of which Mosley had been a member. It was from all these parties that Mr. Dan Griffiths' so-called definitions of Socialism were obtained.

Marx had been accused of advocating banditry. His advocacy of common ownership was an act of restitution. As for banditry, what of the German Nazi's theft of trade union funds?

Mr. Probyn had said that the receipts of funds from big business men would not make any difference to the principles of the B.U.F. Why, then, was it that Mosley is dropping the black-shirt idea and recruiting members who are just ordinary political members without uniform?

If, as is claimed, the B.U.F. is now hard-up for funds, that would only mean that Mosley had added still another to the list of his political failures.

Mr. Probyn. Final Speech.

He said he was only concerned with the B.U.F. He would ask the audience if there was anything wrong in a person changing his view. Is it suggested that no one should change? Sir Oswald Mosley did right to go into the other parties as they were the only ones existing. When he found them rotten he left, just as a workman discards a bad tool and shapes a better one. Fascism is too strong in this country for anything to stop its march to power. It will succeed just as day follows night.

In Italy in 1920 the trade unions had no funds to seize as several strikes had already broken them, and the same was true in Germany. The fact was that trade union leaders had been getting rich and palatial offices which were built out of trade union funds. What has to be recognised, however, is that different nations have a different mentality, and what would be looked upon with horror by one country is quite alright in another. Germans as a race do queer things and so do others. In Japan, for instance, prostitution is

looked upon as an honourable profession. What we do is alien to the mind of the Hottentot.

Ramsay MacDonald has the support of ten or twelve million people and we will no doubt see a pure Socialist racket at the next election.

To take away people's property is pure banditry. And how can you restore property to those who have never had it?

When the British Union of Fascists came into existence they could have called themselves anything they liked. The British Fascists, represented by Miss Lynton-Orman, was only a sub-committee of the Conservative party with a party bias, they were also strike breakers. The B.U.F. stood for a classless organisation.

As far as the division in the party is concerned, which was referred to by his opponent, all it amounted to was a division between uniformed and ununiformed men. The uniformed men were the active supporters of the movement. The objection raised was only a quibble.

His opponent had not made out a case against Fascism. He himself had the SOCIALIST STANDARD every month, but he could not see anything constructive in the little panel referred to—it was all beautifully vague.

We can't get away from the fact that the S.P.G.B. supports all the rottenness of Marx. Pure Marxism was tried in Russia and only succeeded in killing millions. Matters were only improved when Stalin put it aside.

The class war has no economic basis and is only the figment and meanderings of a disordered mind.

The S.P.G.B. simply proposes to continue on its longest way for the next 666 years as it has in the last 31 years.

Methods of Open Air Propaganda

A meeting of Party members will be held at Head Office, on Saturday, May 4th, at 7 30 p.m., to consider methods of open air propaganda. Discussion will be opened by Comrade Kohn.

Lecture Syllabuses

The Syllabuses of the lectures given at the Head Office classes during the past winter are available on application to M. Cameron, at 42, Great Dover Street, S.E.1. Price 2s. a set, post free, (with folder, 2s. 3d.).

Sheffield

Sheffield Branch has re-opened propaganda meetings at Barkers' Pool, Sunday evenings at 7.30 p.m.

Notes by the Way

Twenty-five Years' Wealth

This year of Jubilee has been marked by the death of Mr. Arthur Stanley Wills, who left £3,499,777. There is nothing very remarkable in that. What gives it interest is that Mr. Wills belonged to the family of tobacco millionaires, the first of whom died in 1909, the year before King George V ascended to the throne. What has the reign meant to the owners of the tobacco firm? The following table of amounts left at death tells us about the Wills who are dead. We are left to guess what fabulous fortunes have accumulated in the hands of those who are living.

	£
Sir F. Wills (1909)	3,050,556
Sir E. P. Wills (1910)	2,635,160
Mr. H. O. Wills (1911)	5,214,821
Lord Winterstoke (1911)	2,548,209
Sir E. C. Wills (1921)	947,753
Mr. H. H. Wills (1922)	2,750,000
Mrs. Hamilton-Fellows (1926)	1,965,183
Mr. F. M. Hamilton-Wills (1927)	5,053,360
Mrs. E. A. Douglas-Hamilton (1927)	1,755,795
Sir G. A. Wills (1928)	10,000,000
Sir G. V. A. Wills (1931)	2,100,000
Mr. A. S. Wills (1935)	3,499,777

What total amount is represented cannot be said with certainty, as some of the money, no doubt, was passed on from one member of the family to another, heavily reduced, of course, by death duties.

It is certain, anyway, that the reign has not been too bad for those who have lived by the exploitation of the tobacco workers.

It is worthy of note that this is a record no banking family in this country can hold a candle to.

Twenty-five Years' Poverty

Now for another side of the picture. The normal rate of pay for adult tobacco workers is 61s. 6d. for men and 38s. 6d. for women. Even if Wills paid more than the minimum it will take quite a while for any dozen of their workers to amass £41,500,000. Then there are seven per cent. of them out-of-work. These will have to dig into their accumulated capital until the tobacco barons can "afford" to employ them again.

During the twenty-five years, while the Wills' family have been lording the earth on the backs of the working class, there have been millions of men, women and children of the working class in the grip of perpetual poverty.

At any time between 1909, when Sir F. Wills left his £3 millions, and 1911, when Lord Winterstoke left his £2½ millions, there were 600,000 or 700,000 destitute persons receiving poor law relief in England and Wales alone. When Mr. H. H. Wills passed on in 1922, leaving £2,750,000, there were two to two-and-a-half millions registered unemployed. Including the non-insured unemployed, there must have been at least 2,750,000—just one for every £1 of Mr. Wills' superfluous wealth. Between 1931 and 1935 unemployment has been in the region of two-and-a-half to three millions.

One final point to show how prosperous the workers have become. According to Inland Revenue figures analysed in the *Sunday Express* (April 7th, 1935), only about one in four of the people who die each year leaves more than £100. The workers, who carry the millionaire class on their backs, do not own even £100; and this after generations of gestures by the rich and politicians of their solicitude for the troubles of the poor. It is as true now as it was when Tolstoy said it, that the rich will do everything for the poor except get off their backs.

Blank Cartridges

"The whine of machine-gun bullets shall be the Communist answer to Mosley."

This was the top note in the speech of the Communist, Mr. John Gollan, at the Memorial Hall, when speakers of five parties delivered their message to youth. According to the report in *Forward* (April 13th), "Youth," or a large part of it, was enraptured with the phrase "whine of machine-gun bullets." But even Communist youth in its more sober moments must have detected behind the whine the bray of the fatuous ass. It is very much to the point to recall that when the Communists in Germany were slaughtered in the numerous fights with the Nazis and the German Police (prior to Hitler's advent to power), they fought with sticks and stones, knuckle-dusters, and a few revolvers. The only machine-gun used by them in the 1929 riots was a dummy! The Russian Government, which helped to arm the German military machine, and gave bombing planes to the Turkish capitalists, apparently couldn't spare one real machine-gun for its German working class dupes.

A Social Reformer Answers Himself

At intervals since the War, Mr. Lloyd George has sought to stage a come-back on a repainted

platform of social reforms. The answer to all such attempts to reform capitalism was given by him twenty-five years ago, in a speech at the City Temple (October 17th, 1910):—

Before we succeed in remedying one evil, fresh ones crop up.

A Sixteenth Century Lloyd George

Every time unemployment rises to high levels some feather-brained political genius is sure to rush into print and speech with a brand-new proposal for solving the problem by setting the unemployed at work constructing public works, roads and bridges, and so on. The funny thing is that they all believe they are the first ever to have thought of such schemes. Mr. Lloyd George's "New Deal" plan is at bottom nothing more than this, and his predecessors are legion. The I.L.P. and Labour Party have been trotting it out for forty years. Sir Oswald Mosley, when he propounds it for the British Union of Fascists, has doubtless forgotten that Mr. John Strachey borrowed it for him from Bishop Berkeley, who recommended it 200 years ago, coupled with what was, in effect, slave-labour for the unemployed.

Earlier still, when Henry VIII was first contemplating the seizure of the lands and property of the monasteries, a plan was put forward for using some of the plunder "for aiding the poor and unfortunate, building up new towns, restoring decayed manors, reclaiming unprofitable parks, and constructing new roads throughout the kingdom." (*Economic Causes of the Reformation in England*, Oscar Marti. Macmillan & Co. 1929. Page 195.)

Who Exploits the Indian Workers and Peasants?

Writing in the *Indian Labour Journal* (Nagpur, March 10th, 1935), Mr. M. Vakil, M.A., LL.B., states that economists have estimated that "no less than one-third of the proceeds of the exploitation of India" go to Indian princes, Indian landlords and Indian capitalists. When the Indian capitalists have achieved their aim of diminishing the power and wealth of the British ruling class in India, and increasing their own share, the victims of capitalist exploitation will find that they have only exchanged one master for another, without any material change in their condition.

Jews and Jews

The impression is widely held that the Fascist antipathy for Jews is directed against them indiscriminately. Actually, numbers of wealthy and influential Jews in German industrial and banking concerns have been left undisturbed.

The following report from the *Daily Herald* (March 27th, 1935) relates to the building of a strategic railway by which, it is said, Japan intends to prepare the way for attacking Russia in Siberia:—

Strong reports were current last night that Herr Otto Wolf, the German-Jewish steel magnate who has been left undisturbed by the German Government "in order that he may work for Germany," has practically completed negotiations with the Japanese Government for the construction of the railway.

Pigs and Patriotism

The more blatantly selfish the profit-seeking aims which the capitalists cloak under the name of patriotism the more they and their tools prate of the lofty other-worldliness of their ideals. It was always said before the War that the dynastic feuds of Serbia were at bottom the rivalries of the pig and wheat producing interests, having different views as to Government policy with regard to tariffs and foreign alliances, and one of the incidents which preceded the assassination at Sarejevo was an Austrian tariff war against the import of Serbian pigs.

In the recent tension between Germany and Lithuania over the sentence of twelve years' imprisonment on the leader of the Nazi party in Lithuania, it was actually reported (*News-Chronicle*, March 28th, 1935) that the Lithuanian Government had offered to release their prisoner if Hitler would permit the importation of 10,000 Lithuanian pigs.

Germany's Former Colonies

Capitalist governments do not acquire colonies for the benefit of the native inhabitants, but for the benefit of the home traders and investors. The view was, however, assiduously propagated during the War, even by persons who admitted the profit motive behind colonisation, that the German capitalists treated natives much more harshly than did the British or the other Allied Powers.

Now the *Manchester Guardian* (April 16th) rejects even this thin excuse for the plunder by the Allied capitalists of their German rivals:—

Abuse of Germany as a colonial administrator was part of war-time propaganda... the implication being that she was unfit to govern them. But the truth is that Germany was a highly efficient colonial administrator, that some at least of her former colonies were better off under her rule than they are now.

H.

"The Socialist Party of Great Britain and Questions of the Day"

Deals with the founding of the Socialist Party, the Liberal, Tory, Labour and Communist parties and the I.L.P., the Russian Dictatorship, War, Trade Unions, Social Reforms etc

80 Pages—Price 3d. (Post free—4d.)

THE SOCIALIST STANDARD

MAY,



1935

OFFICIAL NOTICE

All communications for the Executive Committee. Subscriptions for the SOCIALIST STANDARD, Articles, and Correspondence submitted for insertion therein, should be addressed—The Socialist Party of Great Britain, 42, Great Dover Street, London, S.E.1, to whom Money Orders should be made payable.

The meetings of the Executive Committee are held at the Head Office, every Tuesday, at 7.30 p.m.

TERMS OF SUBSCRIPTIONS.

Twelve Months, post free 2s. 6d.
Six Months, post free 1s. 3d.

Our Annual Conference

Our 32nd Annual Conference took place on Good Friday and the following Saturday at Fairfax Hall, Haringay, London. The attendance of delegates and members at Friday's session was by general consent the best for many years, taxing the capacity of the Hall.

The year's work of the Party's Executive Committee, sub-committees, officials and organisers, was reviewed by the delegates. Of particular interest this year was the report on the series of educational classes held at our headquarters on Sunday afternoons through the winter months. The lectures covered a very wide scope, including, to mention a few, lectures on economics, banking, commerce, history, philosophy, science, art, and literature. In all there were twenty-eight lectures, and a feature of them was that they were the work of a wide selection of lecturers and others whose co-operation was sought by the organiser in working out the course and drawing up the syllabuses. The success of the whole series was a tribute to co-operative organisation. The number of students who attended the course was a record for any series of lectures at Party headquarters, and exceeded the available accommodation. Arrangements are being made to continue these lectures next year on the lines of a more advanced second-year course. In addition, arrangements are in hand for the past winter's lectures to be repeated at branches, particularly at branches in the provinces. This ambitious scheme will involve 600 tutorial classes, but the organiser is confident that the help of new tutors coming forward from the last course will make it possible to carry the scheme through successfully.

Reports on various departments of the Party's

work showed unmistakably that there has been a solid and substantial growth of the Party. The number of new members during the year was three times the number of lapsed members for the same period. Provincial propaganda was carried out more widely and established on a more regular basis than for many years. The sales of THE SOCIALIST STANDARD over the past six years have increased by fifty per cent. Six years ago, when we took a seven years' lease on the premises of our present headquarters, many of our more cautious members had doubts about the necessity and the ability to meet the expense of such large premises. Our experience since then has shown that the step was justified. Premises that were then considered too large and ambitious are now, as a result of our continuous growth, not large enough to accommodate all our activities, and we find ourselves faced with the task of securing new and larger premises. Conference recommended a special fund to be set up to meet the inevitable extra expense which will be involved.

Optimism was the keynote of Conference—an optimism justified by the sound and fruitful work of the past few years.

We have excellent reasons for our optimism. Since 1929, sales of THE SOCIALIST STANDARD, Party income, membership, and activities generally, have increased by fifty per cent. or more. Loyal support from sympathisers will enable us to increase our rate of growth in the years ahead of us.

Hauling Down the Colours in Russia

"I raise my glass to the health of His Majesty the King of Great Britain."—Maxim Litvinov.

The world gasped at the way the Bolsheviks played at royalism and flunkeyism when Mr. Eden visited Moscow, but the amazement soon passed and the incident is well-nigh forgotten by now. There are reasons, however, why it should be saved from oblivion.

Mr. Eden, Lord Privy Seal, was visiting Russia to explore Soviet views on international alignments. The Russians wanted to impress and flatter him, so they behaved in accordance with the prescribed code which governs diplomatic junketings. They provided for him and his party luxurious coaches on the railway, equipped with every comfort and convenience. Then, "as the train steamed into Moscow Station, Mr. Eden saw scores of Union Jacks linked with Red Flags adorning the snow-covered platform." (*Evening Standard*, March 28th.)

"On the platform itself a crack Soviet regimental guard was drawn up. They saluted as he alighted from his carriage."

The Government newspaper, *Izvestia*, found in Mr. Eden a "brilliant mind." Mr. A. J. Cummings, *News-Chronicle* correspondent, thought that Stalin was taken with the "engaging address of the handsome Englishman," and Mr. Eden "was certainly impressed with the friendliness and rugged strength" of Stalin. (*News-Chronicle*, March 30th.)

On the night of March 29th, Mr. Eden was an honoured guest at the Opera House. Let Mr. Cummings describe the scene (*News-Chronicle*, March 30th):—

The British Minister had a great popular reception. When he entered the imperial box, accompanied by M. Litvinov, M. Maisky, the Ambassador to Britain, and the British Ambassador, the vast proletariat audience rose to its feet en masse and applauded him for several minutes.

The applause continued through the playing of the national anthem by the orchestra, followed by the Internationale.

At a banquet given by Mr. Litvinov, Russian Commissar for Foreign Affairs, the crowning point was that this representative of Communism toasted the Health of the King. The *Daily Telegraph* correspondent reports (*Daily Telegraph*, March 29th):—

"I raise my glass to the health of His Majesty the King of Great Britain, to the prosperity and happiness of the British people, and to your very good health, sir."

The entire assembly rose and drank the toast.

Altogether it was a splendid affair, marred only by one or two errors and omissions. Some of the Union Jacks were upside down—the British

Communist Party must see to this. Also, Mr. Eden missed a splendid opportunity in not giving a photo of his handsome self to Stalin. After all, Hitler gave one to Sir John Simon.

The last comment is an unkind one from Hitler's deputy Hess, who thought it in bad taste that the people who shot the Czar should toast the health of his cousin. The Communist Press, it may be noted, omitted to report these particulars of the Moscow visit.

Before leaving the subject, we may recall how fiercely the Communists denounced Sir Stafford Cripps for his support of the monarchy a year ago. The *Labour Monthly* (Feb., 1934) called it "kissing the toes of King George." The *Daily Worker*, official organ of the Communist Party, told us (Jan. 9th, 1934) that Sir Stafford "cowers before the throne," "kneeling obediently," and that he was a "frightened booby." In its issue of January 12th, under the heading "Cripps Fawns upon the King," it had the following words:—

Sir Stafford Cripps has now taken to openly fawning upon the monarchy, and bids fair to out-Tory the loyalist of diehard Tories in his sycophantic utterance in this regard.

Sir Stafford and Mr. Pollitt ought to get along better in future now that they have in common almost the last thing that hitherto divided them.

The Meaning of it All

The incidents are not intrinsically important, and in other circumstances might be ignored as of little account. Behaviour of the same kind in 1918, when the Belshéviks, knowing their military defencelessness, were accepting a dictated peace from the still undefeated German generals, would have been taken as an empty formula deceiving no one and creating

THE SOCIALIST PARTY OF GREAT BRITAIN

OBJECT.—The establishment of a system of society based upon the common ownership and democratic control of the means and instruments for producing and distributing wealth by and in the interest of the whole community.

DECLARATION OF PRINCIPLES

THE SOCIALIST PARTY of Great Britain HOLDS—

1. That society as at present constituted is based upon the ownership of the means of living (i.e., land, factories, railways, etc.) by the capitalist or master class, and the consequent enslavement of the working class, by whose labour alone wealth is produced.

2. That in society, therefore, there is an antagonism of interests, manifesting itself as a class struggle, between those who possess but do not produce, and those who produce but do not possess.

3. That this antagonism can be abolished only by the emancipation of the working class from the domination of the master class, by the conversion into the common property of society of the means of production and distribution, and their democratic control by the whole people.

4. That as in the order of social evolution the working class is the last class to achieve its freedom, the emancipation of the working class will involve the emancipation of all mankind without distinction of race or sex.

5. That this emancipation must be the work of the working class itself.

6. That as the machinery of government, including the armed forces of the nation, exists only to conserve the monopoly by the capitalist class of the wealth taken from the workers, the working class must organise consciously and politically for the conquest of the powers of government, national and local, in order that this machinery, including these forces, may be converted from an instrument of oppression into the agent of emancipation and the overthrow of privilege, aristocratic and plutocratic.

7. That as all political parties are but the expression of class interests, and as the interest of the working class is diametrically opposed to the interests of all sections of the master class, the party seeking working-class emancipation must be hostile to every other party.

8. THE SOCIALIST PARTY of Great Britain, therefore, enters the field of political action determined to wage war against all other political parties, whether alleged labour or avowedly capitalist, and calls upon the members of the working class of this country to muster under its banner to the end that a speedy termination may be wrought to the system which deprives them of the fruits of their labour, and that poverty may give place to comfort, privilege to equality, and slavery to freedom.

Those agreeing with the above principles and desiring enrolment in the Party should apply for membership form to secretary of nearest branch or at Head Office.

no new situation. Yet actually at that time the Bolsheviks behaved with dignity and spirit, contrasting greatly with their behaviour now, when circumstances outwardly are so different. Russia is now a great power, with the biggest army and air force in Europe, moving—or so we are told—in a great triumphal progress of industrial development and political and economic consolidation. That is what gives the gesture of fawning over the representative of British capitalism its significance.

What we are witnessing is the disintegration of Bolshevism as an idea, as a propaganda force, as a living creed. The Russian Government, the outwardly all-powerful, is inwardly hesitant and uncertain. Instead of facing the world as a revolutionary force, sure of its power and ultimate victory, the Bolsheviks have lost their faith. They have come to terms with capitalism as an economic system. Now they are adjusting themselves to the world of capitalist diplomacy, military allowances, pacts of defence and offence, theories of the balance of power and so on.

Glance back at the various proclamations and resolutions of the Communists five, ten and fifteen years ago, and see what tricks time has played on them.

In the Statutes and Conditions of Affiliation to the Communist International (the so-called Twenty-one Points), adopted at the Second Congress, Moscow, 1920, we find set out in harsh, unmistakable terms, the creed which was finally buried to the strain of the National Anthem. In 1920, "heavy civil war" was the Communist road to power in all countries: the Communist International proclaimed "its duty to support, by all the power at its disposal, every Soviet Republic, wherever it may be formed." It is a far cry from that belligerent utterance to the desertion in recent years of the German and Austrian workers, and to the pledge given to Roosevelt to renounce all propaganda in U.S.A.

Now Russia pledges her military aid to French capitalism and seeks a similar capitalist-military pact with British capitalism.

The Forgotten "Twenty-One Points"

In 1920 the "Twenty-one Points" of the Third International demanded of affiliated parties that they:—

Renounce not only avowed social-patriotism, but the false and hypocritical social-pacifism as well. They must systematically demonstrate to the workers that without the revolutionary overthrow of capitalism, neither international arbitration nor conferences regarding the limitation of armaments, nor the "democratic" reorganisation of the League of Nations will be capable of saving mankind from new imperialist wars.

More recently, in 1929, the British Communists were demanding "repudiation of the League of Nations as a capitalist and imperialist institution." (See *Class Against Class*.) Now Russia is encouraging all the illusions it formerly rejected.

In 1920, Communist parties had to pledge themselves to denounce the imperialist colonial policy of their governments and "to support, not in words only, but in deed, the movement for colonial independence." Now it is reported that, in order to get British support, the Russian Government has offered to renounce all propaganda in India, as they did two years ago in U.S.A.

Fifteen years ago the Communists were pledged to carry on illegal propaganda among the troops of their respective countries. Now the Russian Government is depending on French troops for aid against Germany, in the event of war, the latter, incidentally, using armaments which the Russian Government aided them to provide.

The Communists, of course, are not at loss for an answer to these charges. They say that it is all a pretence on the part of Stalin and Litvinov, all part of a policy of super-bluff, the fine flower of Communist cunning. But why is it that fifteen years ago the Bolsheviks had no need of this bluff, and that now, when their strength is seemingly so much greater, they have to adopt it? To deceive the capitalists? Surely they are not so blinded to reality as to imagine that it will.

What has really happened is that the ideas which moved the men who obtained power in 1917 do not reside in those who are the Government in Russia to-day. The old Bolsheviks, rightly or wrongly, saw the world as a battleground of the class struggle with the workers just about to achieve revolutionary victory. The new Bolsheviks see the world, including Russia, as an international Tammany Hall, where groups of governments form and break up, manoeuvre and pull wires, bluff and threaten, flatter and blackmail, and occasionally go in for the open gangsterism of war.

The fact that Russia used to side with Germany against France and England, and now sides with England against Germany, is just one more move in the game, due to a revised estimate of the comparative strengths and future policies of the various groups.

Three Dead Dogmas

The change also marks the burial of three dogmas which were at one time pillars of the Bolshevik doctrine. The first, a common post-war belief all over Europe and America, was that British capitalism was finished, "gone phut," played out, and only waiting for the other bandits to plunder and despoil it. *Class Against Class* devoted page after page to proving this, leading up to the statement that, in that year (1929), we were witnessing "the struggle of a decadent Empire, torn with economic and social conflicts . . ."

The second theory was that Britain had one over-riding foreign policy, which was to contrive, directly and indirectly, by treaties, armed force, finance, and all other means, to "encircle Soviet

Russia with a ring of hostile states," preparatory to achieving the final destruction of that country. In Communist eyes this aim was vital and so deep-rooted as to verge on mania, over-riding even the desire for profit.

The third Bolshevik dogma was that Britain and America were soon about to go to war in a final death struggle. "Hence it is no exaggeration to say that British-American rivalry and preparations for war are the dominating factors in the inter-relations between the capitalist powers to-day." (*Class Against Class*, page 13.)

How do these three pillars of Bolshevik policy look to-day? Is British capitalism finished? Is the Empire in ruins? Have the wealth and power of the British ruling class been wrested from them by internal revolt and external pressure? The answer is obviously not, since not only Russia but France and Italy both seek the aid of British capitalism. The only collapse has been that of the believers in the collapse theory.

Is the one dominating object of British foreign policy to crush Russia with German, French, Polish, etc., aid? Obviously not, since the Russians appear to believe that they can deflect that policy into other channels merely by singing the National Anthem and toasting the King's health, and promising not to encourage disloyalty to the Crown in India.

Lastly, are British and American capitalism about to enter the war for which they are supposed to have been preparing since 1929? Again, obviously not. Indeed a search through current Communist literature shows that the Communists have completely forgotten it.

In abandoning the principles it formulated in

1920, and the dogmas on which it fed in the following years, the Bolshevik movement has accommodated itself to capitalism and proved by its own evolution that the original assumptions of the Communist Party were wrong.

A Glory that has Departed

The truth is—and the sooner the workers who admire Bolshevism recognise it the better—that the fervour and confidence of the early days of Bolshevism is a glory that has departed. They believed then that they had a conquering idea which would give them the mastery of the world and usher in Socialism.

They were wrong, for two reasons. The first was their hopeless misreading of the working class outside Russia, leading them to suppose that the workers were about to overthrow capitalism. The second was their equally mistaken notion that Socialists in command of the State forces can thereby transform a non-Socialist population into a spear-head for Socialist construction and Socialist world-propaganda.

Of those who shared the early Bolsheviks' general aim—Socialism—and who recognised the integrity and sincerity of the Bolshevik leaders and party, the S.P.G.B. was almost alone in recognising at the time their inevitable failure. That failure has already corrupted the Bolshevik movement as a force for Socialism, and its repercussions will continue for many years to hamper the growth of Socialist movements elsewhere. The year 1935 marks a milestone in the process of disintegration, which will leave behind a harvest of capitalism where the early Bolsheviks thought they were planting seeds of Socialism. H.

A Defence of the Communist Party

The letter below is a criticism of the "Letter from a former Communist" published in the March SOCIALIST STANDARD:—

To the Editor of the SOCIALIST STANDARD.

Your miserable, weak and disgruntled attack on the Communist Party and the Soviet Union prompts me to defend the only working-class party which really fights for the workers whether employed or unemployed. Your letter is an insult to those who understand Socialism and the teachings of Karl Marx. All you have said is the same old claptrap trotted out month by month by the SOCIALIST STANDARD, without giving a lead on any particular issue of the day. You say Communists are committed to the return of a third Labour Government; Communists stand in support of candidates for the united front, which is very different. Apparently you can't differentiate between the bureaucrats of the Labour Party and rank and file who are working class which the Communists are giving a correct lead. Further, there were no candidates put up by the S.P.G.B. in the last election, and one might well ask where is their political action so much advertised in the STANDARD.

Your attack on the Soviet Union and Comintern show a lack of understanding in tactics of the Communist Revolu-

tionary Movement, the pacts that are made by the Soviet are in defence of our Socialist Fatherland and the workers of these countries, otherwise there would have been war and, perhaps, the destruction of the revolutionary movement the world over. As to the statement that Communist Parties are mere advertising agencies for Russia, ask the unemployed who it is leading their fight against the Unemployment Act and ask the workers who lead the struggle against Fascism and the answer will be the Communists. There is hardly a day passes when the capitalist Press has to report, very reluctantly, activities of Communists leading workers' struggles in different parts of the world and for which hundreds are thrown in jails. Now, as to reforms which the S.P.G.B. is for ever raking up, will you read up Marx where he says: "Communists fight for momentary and immediate demands of the working class." Which, as I understand that, it is a means of mobilising the workers for the final overthrow of capitalism, not much in common with reformists here. Finally, I will ask how much longer is the S.P.G.B. going to sit down in comfort writing such stuff when action along the lines of a united front is more necessary to-day than ever. Have the unemployed to starve while you pretend to teach Socialism?

H. FIPKIN.

Chelsea, S.W.3.

Reply.

The first point in Mr. Fipkin's letter is that the S.P.G.B. does not give the workers "a lead on any particular issue of the day." The same criticism is repeated in other phrases elsewhere in the letter and is a fundamental part of the case, not only of the Communists, but of the Labour Party. Socialists hold that Socialism cannot be achieved until a majority are prepared to work and struggle and organise consciously for Socialism. Our Labour and Communist opponents deny this and contend that a minority who do want Socialism can rally a non-Socialist majority by day-to-day struggles about wages, reforms, etc., and lead them on blindly to Socialism. Mr. Fipkin tells us, for example, that it is the Communists who lead the unemployed in "their fight against the Unemployment Act." The statement is by no means an accurate one, for the great majority of workers and unemployed who demonstrate and vote against the Unemployment Act do so, not behind Communist leadership, but as followers of the Labour Party. But far more important is the fact that this policy does not succeed in leading the workers to Socialism. On the contrary, it fosters and deepens their illusion that reforms are the proper objective for a working class movement.

In order to get the workers to concentrate on these minor questions their "leaders" have to delude their followers into believing that that is a fruitful policy. The leaders, therefore, cannot, while advocating reforms, also put the case for Socialism. Communist leaders are no exception. Wanting votes at any price, they concentrate on the list of reforms which they imagine will gain votes, and they thrust the question of Socialism into the background.

The Communists, including Mr. Fipkin, do not admit this. They say that in some metaphysical fashion it is possible to separate the action from the theory on which it is based. Thus Mr. Fipkin tells us that voting for Labour Party candidates in order to get the Labour Party into power at the next election is justified because of the difference between the Labour "bureaucrats" and the "rank-and-file who are working class." This is absurd. In the first place the mere fact that most Labour Party supporters are members of the working class no more requires Socialists to endorse their wrong theories and actions than does the fact that millions of workers support the Liberal and Tory parties require us to vote for Liberal and Tory candidates. Secondly, the class struggle and the ballot-box both recognise only two alternatives, without any convenient fence in between to accommodate the muddle-headed. When Communists go to the poll, and tell workers to do likewise, in support of a Labour candidate, there is no method except in their own imagination by which a vote for the Labour "bureaucrat" counts not for him

but for the working class. Previous elections show this clearly enough. At the past elections, when Communists were working for the return of a Labour Government, they voted for such people as Ramsay MacDonald, J. H. Thomas, and the present Lord Snowden, and themselves shared the stupid notion that by so doing they were helping the working class and Socialism. What they were doing was placing the control of the machinery of Government in the hands of people who would use it to maintain capitalism. The Communists are now intending to do the very same thing again, and no amount of differentiating between the Labour "leaders" and the Labour "led" will get them out of the position in which they have placed themselves.

Mr. Fipkin blandly asks us why the S.P.G.B. did not run candidates at the last election. Let us put the question in its proper form. Why was it that the Communists were able to run twenty-five candidates and throw away thousands of pounds on forfeited deposits and election expenses while the S.P.G.B. cannot afford to do so? The answer is that the £150 election deposit, forfeited unless the candidate polls one-eighth of the votes, is a serious obstacle to a party dependent on the meagre subscriptions of workers, but not an obstacle to a party which has access to ample funds from well-to-do supporters and the Third International.

Mr. Fipkin defends the pacts entered into by Russia with those whom it denounces as imperialist brigands on the ground that they are in defence of Soviet Russia and "otherwise there would have been war." This is surely a most hollow argument.

For years the Communists said, with truth, that pacts with capitalist powers could not overcome the inherent rivalries of capitalism. Now we are expected to swallow without hesitation the stale old arguments of capitalist Liberals just because the Russians have abandoned their old position and occupied that which they formerly denounced. Ten or twelve years ago the Third International and the Russian Government would have laughed at the notion which Mr. Fipkin now puts over, that hobnobbing with the representatives of capitalism would prevent war.

In his defence of reformism towards the end of his letter, Mr. Fipkin quotes from Marx to show that it is a correct policy to fight for momentary and immediate demands in order to mobilise the working class. The answer is that the policy has now been tried out exhaustively and has been shown to be totally unsound. It does not mobilise the working class for Socialism. All that it does is to undermine and corrupt the strength and solidarity of the group which tries to carry it out. Mr. Fipkin's statement that there is "not much in common with reformists here" reads curiously in a letter which earlier on gives us Mr. Fipkin's justification for Communists finding so much in common

with the other reformists as to vote for the labour candidates!

The letter concludes by asking us to go in for "action" instead of sitting down "in comfort." Mr. Fipkin has curious notions about the conditions of working class life if he thinks that the workers in the S.P.G.B., employed and unemployed, are in a state of comfort. Mr. Fipkin should get about and find out what working class life is really like.

His plea for "action" would be funny if it had not a tragic side. When the S.P.G.B. was formed in 1904, Mr. Fipkin's spiritual fathers made the same plea. They said that they had no time for Socialism, what they wanted was action immediately, so that the unemployed should not starve while we were preaching Socialism. After Mr. Fipkin and other reformists have been busy car-

rying out immediate action for thirty years, instead of being able to tell us that the unemployed are now properly provided for and we need, therefore, worry no longer, Mr. Fipkin, full of innocent zeal, rushes up to tell us again that we must postpone preaching Socialism while still more immediate action takes place to prevent the unemployed from starving. Are we to wait another thirty years while the immediate actionists have more time to prove how wrong they are?

There is only one immediate necessity for the working class, and that is not rallying them for some tuppenny-ha'penny amendment to the Unemployment Act, but immediate action for Socialism, which presupposes immediate and unremitting efforts to preach Socialism and make Socialists.

ED. COMM.

Man and His Means

"World Resources and Industries." By Erich W. Zimmermann. Harper & Brothers, publishers, New York and London, 1933.)

The author of this work is a Professor of Economics at the University of North Carolina, but, as the title of his work indicates, it is with other aspects of economic science than those of value or price determinants that he is largely concerned here. A vast array of technical language is employed, but there are such things as dictionaries for the use of those with the will to understand, and, given care, the meaning of much of the terminology does, of course, follow from the contexts.

The present review can only be brief, considering, among other things, the extent of this well-printed tome of over 800 pages. In broad outline the author sets out to present an account of many of the world's natural and technical resources by way of a philosophical-cum-scientific approach, which Marxians will appreciate. Not that Zimmermann is strictly Marxian, or intends to be so. He does not even mention the pioneering work of Marx; nor does he claim to expound the Marxian method. But then, "Big Ben" is not Marxian, yet the celebrated overlord of Westminster will tell us the time—when he is working. Still, the Marxian thesis finds a footing, even though the master lurks in the background unnoticed.

The Socialist does not eschew the works of those who fail or even foul his aspirations. Rather does he utilise his critical sieve to detach the sugar from the sand, and appropriates either, as may serve his purpose towards Socialism. However, Mr. Zimmermann assumes the role of the

economic geographer, taking the earth and its contents, inanimate, of course, with man as the "highest" product of the earth's surface, as being two complementary factors indissolubly linked together as the basis of the study of the social sciences.

This may appear off-hand as a mere commonplace, but all scientific fact is commonplace—when we know it. That scientific generalisation is important is a sufficient justification for its repetition.

In the opening chapter the author comes firmly to grips with what is known as the teleological concept, i.e., the idea of a god-given attribute of design in nature. He does not say so in so many words, but when discussing the nature of resources he reduces the word "resource" to an expression of "human appraisal," hence "a purely subjective concept." But here let those who are about to cast the first stone sit back and think awhile; the stone may prove useful in other ways.

Zimmermann's "subjective concept" does not mean that he denies the objective existence of the earth's economic potentialities. He is but stressing the fact that human wants, requirements and capabilities must be related to all the earth's belongings before they can be accounted "resources."

The contention is that prior to the emergence of man upon the earth, although Mother Earth was filled with "fertile soil, with trees and edible fruits, with rivers and waterfalls, with coal beds, oil pools and mineral deposits, the forces of gravitation, of electro-magnetism, of radio activity," although the "sun sent forth his life-giving rays, gathered the clouds, raised the winds,"

still there were "no resources." Therefore does it follow that "a man-less universe is void of resources." We are the final arbiters in the process of judgment. Resources therefore "are the environment in the service of man." It is we who make them resources; they are not sent by "God."

Well does the author follow this line of reasoning to its logical sequence, considered in the light of the historical growth of human society. For human wants are regulated and germinated in relation to what our author calls the "functional" aspect of man's environment. Thus does he emphasise the relativity of the resource concept from the historical and social standpoint. He says:—

To those who are used to viewing resources as material factors of a physical nature, this functional interpretation of resources must seem disconcerting. It robs the resource concept of its concreteness and turns it into an elusive vapour. Yet even a cursory survey of the history of civilisation will convince the thoughtful reader of the validity of the subjective, relative or functional interpretation of resources. For each civilisation rests upon a different basis of resources, taps a different combination of environmental aspects. (Page 4.)

This is a point of view which may be well taken by Marxians, who have always emphasised the changes in the economy of society as being largely accounted for by the changes in the modes of wealth production and distribution. In our case the content and meaning is far more explicit than Zimmermann's

When dealing with the rate of progress in inventions, he recurs to the same interpretation. He says:—

The rate of progress of inventions and arts varies considerably during different periods of history.

Moreover, this development follows different directions in different parts of the earth. This last-named fact is readily understood when the arts are conceived as devices or mechanisms used by various groups to adapt themselves better to their specific environment and to adapt that environment to their specific needs. (P. 27.)

Readers of Lewis Henry Morgan, the American Ethnologist, will recall his references to the question of the dissimilarity in the rate of human or social development owing to the lack of technical or natural resources in certain parts of the world.

The social background of that much-debated factor, "inventive genius," is well brought out by Mr. Zimmermann.

He says that "Inventions have a strange appeal to mass psychology; a nation tends to identify itself with its inventors and to sun itself in their glory." Yet were the movements urging inventions understood, the glory would find another perspective. He cites from another American writer:—

In every period, apparently, a people live under a kind of social tension that must be relieved. Something must be expressed. Relief comes through an expressed artist, philosopher, military leader, or scientist, depending on the crucial social need of the moment. Hence Dante, Shakespeare, Voltaire, Bach, Newton, Watt, Morse, Bell, Edison and Marconi

must be regarded as fuses that blow and that enable society to short circuit itself by following the lines of least resistance. The leader invariably expresses the massed unconscious aspirations of the race and responds to the social tension of which he may not even be aware. (Page 28.)

Clinching this point from another source of information, he tells us of 148 cases of simultaneous inventions, many of which were made by more than two inventors.

From all this he proceeds to discuss the more technological side of resources in the modern world, and a mine of information is given from many sides. The maps, tables, diagrams, etc., will be found exceedingly interesting and useful. Agriculture, major food crops—wheat and rice—sugar, animal and vegetable oils, coal, iron and steel, water power, electrical power, the chemical industry, precious metals, etc., are all given with a view to their study in relation to geographical, climatic, and social forces.

Particularly interesting is the chapter on "resources from waste." Those industries engaged in the utilisation of waste or by-products he describes as "Second Storey" industries. In describing and differentiating between earlier and later methods of production and the things produced, he gives a nasty tilt to those who still think that "land ownership" is the major concern of to-day. For:—

As civilisation advances, the relative importance of "land," or the untransformed aspects of nature, decreases, and the two other agents of production, labour and capital, gain in proportion. As science becomes bolder and more efficient this movement away from nature gains momentum, and in extreme cases production rests only indirectly on "land" and is freed from the limitations which a direct dependence on "land" involves. (Page 762.)

The "waste" utilisation industries particularly emphasise this fact. Among many examples the following must suffice:—

Ox galls, gall stones, various glands such as thyroid, pituitary, etc., are manufactured into drugs in pharmaceutical laboratories. About fifty preparations are made for use in the medical profession, among which pepsin, pancreatin, thyroid, supernatin and pituitary liquid may be mentioned. Ox gall is also used in the manufacture of water-colour paints and ink, to which it imparts tenacity and fluidity. It is used as a substitute for India ink, as an ingredient in varnish, and as a cleansing agent for scouring wool and wool textiles. Gall stones are exported to the Orient, especially Japan, where they are cherished as charms. Bladders and the small intestines are used in the sausage department. Some of the finer grades of intestines are used as caps for perfume bottles and by gold beaters; others are used by brewers as linings for beer pipes. Some of the bones, ears and interiors of horns are manufactured into glue, the remainder being used as fertiliser. Specially prepared bones are used for hardening ball bearings and for blueing the steel blades of revolvers and rifles. (Page 770.)

So now we know where our gall stones go to. If anybody objects, don't grow any.

But here we must conclude on a critical note. Throughout the work the author uses the phrase, "Capital," as an essential agent of production;

as equipment for productive purposes. And here we fall foul of him for his lack of real scientific perspective. Pressed to its logical conclusion, such "Capital" makes the flint stones of our primitive ancestors capital, and primitive society as capitalism, which is, of course, historically absurd. Had Mr. Zimmermann fully employed the Marxian thesis, such a sociological monstrosity would never have been written by him. Let us apply it and we shall see the profound difference. Capital is wealth used for the production of profit, the latter being derived from the purchase and use of labour power by an idle, parasitic class. And Mr. Zimmermann should surely know that this is a predominant feature of modern society and was not so of all other forms of society which have previously existed. Again, the class division, though hinted at in a relatively unimportant manner, despite its profound influence in social relationships, seems to pass unnoticed by Mr. Zimmermann.

Capitalism appears to him as the final stage in social development and is merely in need of improvement or extension through "world planning." This mental attitude leads him into most of the bogs of bourgeois, economic thought. We have here one of those books which reveal how invaluable the Marxian method of research and system of thought really is, despite the author's failure to utilise it to the full.

Still, we suppose that Professors of Economics must remain, well, Professors of Economics!

To those students who have some grounding in the knowledge that society is based upon private property in the means of living, with its ever-pressing corollary of the class struggle, who know something of the theories of value and surplus value, above all, who know of the materialist conception of history, we ask them to make use of this work. A visit to the public library may have to be made, as the price of this volume is not likely to be a proletarian one.

ROBERTUS.

You May Sleep Out Now

Everybody's Weekly is one of those benevolent papers that exist largely in order to help the poor to win easy money in crossword competitions and football pools. It also stands firmly for the principles of liberty and justice, but it is not so blatant as *John Bull*. There are no "open" letters. Some time ago a very pathetic case was brought to the notice of the Press. An ex-Guardsman, named Thomas Parker, like many other unemployed workers, was sleeping out while searching for an exploiter. He was unlucky, and got fourteen days' hard labour for the offence. Then he died in prison. . . . Monstrous sentence!

Here was an opportunity to remedy a grievous injustice. *Everybody's Weekly* suddenly discovered that the poor had no right to sleep in the streets—not even to die there. The matter was quickly brought to Parliament.

As a result of this agitation one more liberty has been granted to the workers. . . .

It was Anatole France who once remarked that "The law in its majestic equality forbids the rich as well as the poor to sleep under the arches, to beg in the streets, and to steal bread."

Of course, you must not steal bread, begging is still an offence, but when the new Vagrancy Bill becomes law you will enjoy the privilege of sleeping on the pavements to your heart's desire.

Progress is built on these useful little things. The starving and the homeless will now be permitted to expire peacefully in the streets, secure in the knowledge that no minion of the law can drag them to a more comfortable bed.

KAYE.

Trade Union Branches

The Socialist Party of Great Britain is prepared to consider applications from Trade Unions and other organisations for a representative to state the case for Socialism. Travelling expenses only are required.

The Socialist Party: its Principles and Policy

Price 2d. (post free 2½d.)

Send your orders to the Literature Secretary, 42, Great Dover Street, London, S.E.1

"SOCIALISM AND RELIGION"

48 pages. TWOPENCE 2½d. post free.

THE SOCIALIST STANDARD

Fill in and post to Literature Secretary, 42, Great Dover Street, London, S.E.1, and get this paper regularly.

Please send me THE SOCIALIST STANDARD regularly for 12 months, for which I enclose 2s. 6d. (for six months, 1s. 3d.)

Name

Address

Open Air Meetings

Sundays:

Regents Park	11.30 a.m.
Clapham Common	6 p.m.
Avenue Road, Clock Tower, Lewisham	7.30 p.m.
West Green Corner	8 p.m.
Clapton Square (near Hackney Baths)	8 p.m.
Victoria Park	3 p.m.
Queens Road, Bayswater (near Whiteley's)	8 p.m.
Brook Road, Hackney	8 p.m.

Mondays:

Ridley Road, Dalston, E.8	8 p.m.
----------------------------------	--------

Tuesdays:

Clissold Corner, Albion Road, N.16	8 p.m.
---	--------

Wednesdays:

Windsor Road, Forest Gate, E.	8 p.m.	Hackney Town Hall	8 p.m.
--------------------------------------	--------	--------------------------	--------

Thursdays:

Ridley Road, Dalston, E.8.	8 p.m.	"Salmon and Ball," Bethnal Green, E.	8 p.m.
-----------------------------------	--------	---	--------

Saturdays:

London Road, Wembley	7.30 p.m.
-----------------------------	-----------

BRANCH DIRECTORY

BATTERSEA.—Sec., 2, Hanbury Road, S.W.11. Branch meets Thursday, 8.30 p.m., at The Waiting Room, Latchmere Baths, entrance in Burns Road.

BIRMINGHAM.—Sec., E. Jesper, 38, Rollason Road, Erdington. Branch meets Jeams Café, Newton Street. First Wednesday in month at 8 p.m.

BLOOMSBURY.—Branch meets every Monday at 7.30 p.m., at A.E.U. Hall, 39, Doughty Street, W.C. (Near Grays Inn, Road.) Sec., Miss B. Foster, 11, Regent Square, W.C.1.

CENTRAL.—Membership obtained only through the Ex. Committee. Applications to General Sec.

CHISWICK.—(See West London).

DAGENHAM.—Branch meets alternate Mondays (from 4th February, at 8 p.m., Pettitts' Farm, Heathway. Sec. H. Berry, 6, Cannington Road, Dagenham, Essex.

ECCLES.—Branch meets 1st and 3rd Mondays in month at Railway Temperance Room, Four Bridges, Wellington Road, 7.30 p.m. Lecture and discussion, 8.45. Non-members invited. Secretary, Mrs. F. LEA, 5, Gaskell Road, Eccles, Lancs.

EDINBURGH.—Communications to Sec., D. Lamond, at 15, Barclay Place.

GLASGOW.—Branch meets 2nd and 4th Mondays in month, 8 p.m., at 98 Naburn Street, Glasgow, C.5. Communications to J. Higgins, 18, Balgair Street, Glasgow.

HACKNEY.—Branch meets Friday, 7.30 p.m., at Old Gravel Pit Hall, Vallette Street, E.9. Lecture after each meeting. Communication to Sec., E. Chalkley, 21, Bridge Street, E.9.

ILFORD.—Branch meets Mondays at 8 p.m. at 142, Richmond Road. Discussion after Branch business. Communications to Sec., at above address.

ISLINGTON.—All communications to F. W., 92, Wellington Road, Holloway, N.2. Branch meets on Fridays at 8 to 10.30 p.m., at Room 4, Co-operative Hall, 129, Seven Sisters Road, N.

LEYTON.—Communications to Sec., Dick Jacobs, 12, Clifford Rd., Walthamstow, E.17. Branch meets Thursday, 8 p.m., at Trades Hall, Grove House, High Road, Leyton.

LEWISHAM.—Branch meets Thursdays, at 8 p.m., at The Anchor Club Room, Lewisham Road. Communications to H. A. Russell, 73, Kimberley Road, Nunhead, S.E.15.

MANCHESTER.—Branch meets fortnightly (Mondays) as from 14 Jan., at Craigwell Restaurant, Peter Street (entrance in South Street). Sec., B. A. Lee, 19, Emery Avenue, Chorlton, Manchester.

PADDINGTON.—Branch meeting held on 2nd Friday, and lecture with discussion on 4th Friday in each month, 8 p.m., in the guild room over "Co-op. Stores," 447, Harrow Road, W.10. Literature Sec., W. Veal, 73, Wornington Road, W.10.

ROMFORD.—Branch meets alternate Tuesdays at 8 p.m. commencing February 5th (open to public) at N.U.R. Club, Albert Road. Business followed by Lecture and discussion. Secy. P. Golding, "Basra," Boscombe Ave., Hornchurch.

SHEFFIELD.—Sec., G. H. Southey, 83, Wallace Road, Sheffield, 3. Branch meets alternate Mondays, 7.30 p.m. at Room 2, A.E.U. Institute, Stanley Street.

SOUTHEND-ON-SEA.—Branch meets 1st and 3rd Wednesday in the month, at 8 p.m. at 6, Hermitage Road, Westcliff. Discussion after branch business. Non-members invited. Communications to Sec. at above address.

SOUTHWARE.—Branch meets Fridays at 8 p.m., 42, Great Dover St., S.E.1. Communications to Sec., at above address.

STEPNEY.—Sec., S. Goldstein, 18, Irene House, Flower & Dene Street, Stepney, E.1. Branch meets on Fridays, at 8 p.m., at Working Lads Institute (nr. Whitechapel Station).

TOOTING.—Branch meets 1st Sunday in the month, at 12 o'clock noon, at "The Springfield Social Club," 590, Garrett Lane, S.W.17. (Opposite Burntwood Lane). Sec., 174, Haydons Road, S. Wimbledon, S.W.19.

TOTTENHAM.—Branch meets 1st and 3rd Fridays in the month, 7, Bruce Grove, Room 2. Discussion after branch business. Public invited. Communications to C. Godfrey, 49, Napier Road, Tottenham, N.17.

WEST HAM.—Sec., P. Hallard, 22, Colegrave Road, Stratford, E. Branch meets Whitehall School, Parliament Place, Forest Gate, every Thursday at 8 p.m.

WEST LONDON (Chiswick).—Branch meets Fridays, 8 p.m., at Chiswick Club, over 378, High Road, Chiswick, W.4. Communications to Sec., C. Curtis, 52, Parkstead Road, Putney, S.W.15.

WEMBLEY.—Communications to H. G. Holt, 28, Charterhouse Avenue, Wembley, Middlesex. Branch meets every Friday at 8 p.m., at Cafe-Restaurant, over 170, High Road, Wembley. Discussion after branch business.

WOOD GREEN.—Communications to Sec. at 44, Boreham Road, Wood Green, N.22. Branch meets 2nd and 4th Wednesday in month at 8.30 p.m., Stirling House, Stuart Crescent.

THE SOCIALIST STANDARD

The Official Organ of **THE SOCIALIST PARTY** of Great Britain.

No. 370. Vol. 31]

London, June, 1935

[Monthly. Twopence

*The Genius
raids, but .
the common
people . .
occupy and
possess.*

—“LAWRENCE
OF ARABIA.”

Tactics and Socialist Policy

OUR critics in the Labour Movement sometimes compliment us on the soundness of our case against capitalism, while questioning our attitude in other directions.

They will agree to our analysis of capitalist society, to our exposition of the cause of poverty and our case that the economic problems of the workers can only be solved by abolishing private property in the means of living and establishing Socialism. The logic of our case often impresses them. Nevertheless, such critics, though impressed, remain unconvinced. Our speakers will find themselves confronted with the questioner who, on being given a logical reply to a question, assumes, sometimes in an offended manner, that the speaker

has simply been clever at his expense. The questioner will go away with the impression that the essence of his point has really been evaded. This attitude causes as much concern to us as to our critics. It is typical of those who maintain that we ignore the everyday struggle and that we should strive for something now, that on the grounds of

expediency we should sometimes put aside the struggle for Socialism and use our votes and platform for more immediate ends. We are represented as taking an immovable stand on “principle,” as opposed to expediency.

Let us say here and now that our emphasis on the soundness of our case is not the result of affection for some abstract principle. Any policy must be either right or wrong in relation to the facts. If the logic of conditions had proved us wrong we would have discarded our policy with no more sorrow than we discard worn-out clothes. As the logic of the facts proves our policy to be correct, we shall pursue it with the same tenacity in the future as in the past.

Our critics who contend that we should devote our attention to something now, should ponder the question to themselves why Socialism should be considered an alternative to capitalism at some time in the remote future, and not to capitalism as it is now. There can be no answer to that question, because the conditions are ripe for Socialism *now*. Socialism is the solution to working-class poverty. There is no justifiable reason that we know of for deferring it to the remote future—and advocating something else but Socialism, is deferring it. If Socialism will end poverty, then why support any policy which at best would only lessen the worst evils? To do so would involve us in a position which is flatly contradictory, and would imply a lack of conviction that Socialism is the only remedy. This is not to say that reforms cannot be of any benefit to the worker. The point is, however, that whatever else reforms do they leave the worker's main problem—his poverty—unsolved. Votes obtained for reforms do not indicate

ON OTHER PAGES

	Page
Pilsudski and Poland...	147
Prosperity in Australia	148
Should the Workers Buy up Capitalism	150
Peace—in Principle ...	152
The Banking System	152
Dr. Edwin Cannan ...	157
Women's Freedom ...	158
Straws ...	159
Meetings, Lectures and Discussions	149 & 160

Socialist strength but its weakness. We would suggest that rather than reforms being gradual stepping-stones to Socialism, the opposite is true—that the extent to which the workers become Socialist will govern the extent to which the capitalist class will be willing to make concessions to the workers by granting them reforms.

Socialism Will End War

Socialism will end war, so why should we weaken our policy for Socialism in order to support a policy which merely aims at stopping war and nothing else, leaving intact the capitalist system, which breeds war? The supporters of anti-war movements do not realise the difficulties of their position. Whilst capitalism remains and is supported by the workers, it will not be difficult should the emergency arise, for the ruling class to persuade them that they have a direct or indirect interest in the defence of capitalist States. The recent Jubilee celebrations illustrate how easily patriotic fervour can be worked up. There is only one real bulwark against war, and that is Socialist knowledge. Socialism will end war, as it will end Fascism and other forms of political repression, and there is no need, therefore, to make a separate question of any one of them. And for the very sound reason that these things are bred by capitalism, and that to end capitalism will end the effects which inevitably arise out of it.

On the question of expediency our critics quite misunderstand our position. We regard our policy as the most expedient for the end we have in view—Socialism. In short, we contend that one of the first conditions for the establishment of Socialism is a sufficient number of workers wanting it. The quickest and surest way to attain this is to spread Socialist knowledge and to make Socialists. Our "something in the meantime" critics, however, seem to favour the point of view that support for reforms, provided that the word "Socialist" is used in connection with them, will have the same result. Hence their support of the Labour Party in the belief that a Labour Government obtaining power on a reformist programme will somehow or other produce Socialism. The logic of twenty and more years of Labour Governments in different parts of the world has not driven home its lessons. Judged in relationship to our object, Socialism, our policy of first making Socialists is the only expedient one, and every policy which puts this off until some time in the future is definitely harmful to Socialism.

Socialists and the Saar

To be fair to our critics, however, there are other aspects to this question of expediency. Current events often produce situations which, to a superficial view, might suggest that our policy should be modified. One such situation which

brought us considerable criticism was the Saar Plebiscite. The argument was put forward that here was a situation where a Socialist should have voted for the *status quo*, that is, for the continuation of the government of the Saar under a commission appointed by the League of Nations, and that to follow any other line would mean the Saar again becoming part of Germany; with the result that working-class political organisations, trade unions, and freedom of democratic elections, would be suppressed. Let us be quite clear on this matter. The issue involved was not the question of Socialism *versus* capitalism. The question of Socialism being offered as an alternative to capitalism under the League of Nations, or capitalism within Nazi Germany, did not, and in the circumstances could not, arise. The question was voting for capitalism with one of two or three forms of government, so that if Socialists had voted for any one of these forms they could be accused of voting for capitalism.

For a Socialist organisation to be in such a position would be to give a completely false impression of Socialist principles to the workers, making them suppose that the antagonism between Socialism and capitalism is not fundamental but may be bridged on certain occasions. As regards the Saar, the arguments used by those who advocated voting for the *status quo* are open to criticism on other grounds also.

A group of anti-Nazis there, summing up the results of the Plebiscite, has confessed that one consequence of the united anti-Nazi front was that some non-Socialist anti-Nazis, who would otherwise have voted against the return to Germany, were reluctant to do so as soon as they found themselves being asked to support a movement largely dominated by Social Democrats and Communists. A similar situation often arises here when Communists vote for Labour Party candidates. Moreover, the bulk of the German workers in the Saar were undoubtedly sympathetic to the Nazi movement, and they readily accepted the charge put forward by Nazi propagandists that the formation of the united anti-Nazi front was evidence that the Social Democrats are not a working-class movement but are prepared to associate with capitalists, including foreign capitalists.

The difficulties into which a Socialist movement would be thrown by dropping its independence would be so great and the confusion so damaging to Socialist propaganda that no worth-while case can be presented for so doing.

The Failure of the German Social Democrats

The German Social Democratic Party provides some striking illustrations of the futility of a policy of compromise. Socialism is not advanced one inch thereby, and the supposed immediate

gains are worse than worthless, as German experience demonstrates.

In the days when there was keen controversy in that Party over Marxian ideas, this question of compromise was long and hotly debated. Expediency won the day and the party departed more and more from the position conceived by some of the founders. Thus, in 1914, when war broke out, the party supported it on the grounds that German capitalism was preferable to "Russian barbarism." What result is there to show now as justification for that compromise?

After the War, Social Democrats came into office alone or in coalitions, or gave support to the Government of the day. They used their position to carry on the administration of capitalism for the sake of the small gains of the "revolution." Where are these gains now?

In 1925 they withdrew their own candidate for the Presidency, in order to support an anti-Socialist, Dr. Marx, and thus keep Hindenburg out, and save the democratic constitution. Hindenburg was elected. Then, in 1932, they supported Hindenburg as presidential candidate, in order to keep Hitler

out and save the democratic constitution. Their candidate, Hindenburg, was elected. Three months later he dismissed the Social Democrats from office and put in creatures of his own, who prepared the way for Hitler. Where is the democratic constitution now?

The S.D.P. complained that Hindenburg had betrayed them. They had, of course, betrayed themselves in all the preceding years—years of political opportunism and bargaining. Far from this policy proving to be expedient to Socialism, Socialism was brought into disrepute.

We contend that the only thing to do is to keep to the position of advocating Socialism as the only solution for working-class poverty and its attendant problems. This is the question on which all working-class problems turn. To deviate from this policy might easily mean that we should soon tread that slippery patch that has overwhelmed and humiliated others who started out with good intentions. The traps of expediency we shall leave for others. We shall continue the sound policy of making Socialists as the essential preliminary for establishing Socialism.

H. W.

Pilsudski and Poland

THE death of Pilsudski, leader of the Polish dictatorship, has set capitalist leaders wondering what is going to happen in Poland and what advantage they can reap from the expected crisis.

Poland, with a population of 33 millions, has many attractions for foreign capitalists. Its potentialities for the foreign investor are large, and as such invite the attention and competition of all. In 1924 Italian investors subscribed to a loan of several million pounds to Poland. It is also playing a considerable part in the various military pacts for which its size, and particularly its geographical position, bordering on powerful states, make it a useful ally and a dangerous enemy.

All of which accounts for the private parleys of the foreign statesmen who so disinterestedly attended the funeral of Pilsudski.

It is interesting to notice that Pilsudski, like other heads of dictatorships, was tarred with the Social Democratic brush. He joined the Polish Socialist Party in 1892 and spent many years in underground warfare, and suffered imprisonment for his activities. When in power after the war, however, his attitude towards his erstwhile comrades changed and, like Mussolini and Stalin, he was ruthless, imprisoning them and crushing their movements.

Poland, a landlocked state reconstituted after the war, has added its quota to European discord

in the effort to secure control of the port of Dantzig to satisfy the hunger of Polish capitalists for a free opening to the sea. It is a predominantly agricultural country with a large exportable grain surplus, but it has also other industries that are growing fast. As an instance, it stands third in the world production of zinc and fourth and fifth, respectively, in European production of hard coal and iron.

From its inception as a state, however, Poland has been torn by conflicting internal interests. There has been the general conflict between the poor and landless peasants and the owners of large estates. The peasants are politically strong and have been able to force through the assemblies agrarian reforms in favour of themselves and at the expense of the large estates.

Another source of internal trouble is due to the fact that different parts of the country have been torn from their original connections to build up the Polish state. For instance, farming districts which were bound by economic ties to border towns in East Prussia have lost all connection with them. Further, a third of the population is not Polish in race or speech.

These conflicting interests found expression in the two-chamber parliament that was elected on the basis of universal suffrage in 1922. The resulting pandemonium cleared the path for dictatorship sponsored by Pilsudski, which has ruled Poland up to the present.

That there were limits to the power of the Polish dictatorship was shown last year when an attempt to foist a new constitution on Poland was defeated. The Bill was prepared and pushed through the Senate by the B.B. Club, the Pilsudski political association of Poland. The powers it proposed to confer have been described as follows:

By the Bill the President of the Republic would have become Commander-in-Chief of the army, both in peace and war; he would have been able to declare war and make peace without consulting his ministers; his acts would have been above the legislature, and he could dismiss his ministers without assigning any reason. The Senate would have become the chief legislative body and ministers would have become responsible to the Premier and not to Parliament. The Bill would have cancelled the last vestiges of democracy in the country. (*Observer*, March 11th, 1934.)

The Bill shows the extent of the anti-democratic wishes of those who hold power in Poland, which had already found expression in the crushing out of democratic movements and the imprisonment of spokesmen of the disaffected. This explodes another emotional illusion that has cursed the working class movement for decades—the illusion that subject peoples are by nature revolutionary and the best ground for Socialist propaganda. How many poems have been written, how many resolu-

tions drafted by companies of working men, glorifying the Polish struggle for liberty from Russian autocracy? It was wasted effort, for now the autocracy that is crushing liberty is home grown.

This brings us back to the question of the early "Socialistic" tendencies of leaders of dictatorships. It has always been a jibe flung at the Socialist: "You would act like the capitalist if you were in his place," and it may be urged now by the uncritical that the Socialists are the worst oppressors when they hold power. The answer to this view is that the Socialist is opposed to the giving of power to any individual or group. It is just because the leadership cult has been propagated by both capitalists and those who claimed to be urging the workers' cause that the way has been cleared for the Pilsudskis and his like.

Let Pilsudski and Poland impress two lessons on the workers. First that no man is so clever, courageous, disinterested or indispensable that the workers should concede to him the capacity to exercise uncontrolled power. Second that the workers' interests are not involved in national movements which, if successful, only change the personnel of the oppressor. GILMAC.

Prosperity in Australia

IN carrying out Socialistic propaganda we are often forced to quote large groups of figures in order to prove our contentions regarding the conditions of the working class. In many cases listeners remark: "Oh, it's enough to give one a headache." If ever figures would do that, those contained in the following statements should certainly upset the mental equilibrium of the workers in Australia and elsewhere.

Recently a census was conducted and the Commonwealth Statistician is gradually bringing to light the results of his labours. For the State of Victoria we find:—

At June 30th, 1933, breadwinners, including pensioners, totalled 899,533, of whom 645,424 were males and 254,109 were females. The pensioners totalled 78,148. The incomes of the breadwinners were:—

No income	10.6 per cent.
Under £1 per week	29.8 " "
Between £1 to £2 per week	18.4 " "
Between £2 to £3 per week	12.2 " "
Between £3 to £4 per week	10.2 " "
Between £4 to £5 per week	7.9 " "
Over £5 per week	10.9 " "

(Age, Melbourne, January, 1935.)

This means that there were, in round figures: 90,000 breadwinners who had no income; 260,000 received less than £1 per week; 165,000 between £1 and £2 per week; 109,000 between £2 and £3 per week; 90,000 between £3 and £4 per week; 70,000

received between £4 and £5 per week; and 98,000 over £5 per week.

This also shows that 70 per cent. of the breadwinners received no more than £3 per week, and only 10.9 per cent. getting over £5.

Similar striking figures are given with regard to the State of Queensland, where, we are told, that, of the total male breadwinners, the conditions were:—

No income	10.3 per cent.
Less than £1	22.0 " "
Between £1 and £2	18.3 " "
Between £2 and £3	13.5 " "

Two-thirds of the male breadwinners had incomes under £3 per week and three-quarters of the female breadwinners had incomes of less than £2 per week.

Surely by this our oversea admirers of Australian conditions will begin to get dizzy.

And when Mr. Lyons, the Prime Minister, tells the Jubilee guzzlers of the magnificent efforts made by "Australia" to overcome the depression, readers will be able to judge who make the sacrifices.

But, before our admirers are altogether overcome, let us glance at how our Australian masters have weathered the storm of depression. In the same year, 1933, the profits of 57 companies (taken as a guide) increased by more than £840,000, and in 1934 increased by a further £430,000. (*Herald*,

Melbourne, January 10th, 1935.) And the *Herald* writer goes on naively to say:—

One aspect of the changing conditions of profit earning which calls for commendation is the manner in which companies have faced the difficult problems confronting them in an endeavour to hasten a return of former prosperity.

So, after all, the workers did not get all the praise.

We are also told by the *Herald* writer, same date, that:—

A number of companies found it advisable to distribute portions of reserves in the form of bonus shares before December 31st, 1934, because of amendments of the Federal Income Tax Act becoming effective after that date. The Colonial Sugar Company doubled its nominal capital by a bonus issue of 350,000 £20 shares. The following list of distributions by thirteen companies involved the handing of nearly 9½ millions of accumulated reserves to shareholders:—

Company.	Amount capitalised.	Proportion of new shares to old.
Carlton Hotels	105,000	21 to 12
Carlton & United Brewery	1,000,000	1 to 2
Carreras	40,000	4 to 1
Colonial Sugar	7,000,000	1 to 1
Goodyear Tyres	250,000	1 to 2
Howards, Brisbane	26,080	1 to 3
J. Fielding	18,000	1 to 10
Melbourne Electric Supply	400,300	1 to 2
Queensland Can.	10,970	1 to 5
Queensland Insurance	250,000	1 to 2
Shepperton Fruit	43,701	1 to 2
Washing. H. Soul	63,000	1 to 4
W. W. Campbell	10,000	1 to 5

After reading the above, one can imagine just how difficult it is to disprove the claim that "prosperity" has returned to these sylvan shores.

The finance writer of the Melbourne *Herald* further tells us that: "With the improvement in general trading conditions in 1934 a number of companies found that additional funds could be used with profit. The following list of new capital issues does not include new issues entailed by reconstructions of capital." There followed a list covering an amount of £1,390,000.

Yet, we still hear workers echoing the prepared statements of the leader writers to the effect that the employers cannot afford the restoration of wage cuts and lost working conditions. In the depths of penury and want, workers seem satisfied with the meanness of conditions. From the heights of luxury and plenty the capitalists cry out for more and more profits.

Fellow workers, all the profits come out of your labours; the more you produce the sooner will you be the victims of another depression such as that which enabled your masters to reduce your standards to the present low level, and which will be taken advantage of to further reduce your wages and conditions. Trade Unions at best can act merely as a brake to ease the downward trend,

and depressions invariably destroy much of their effectiveness in this regard.

There is only one way by which an end can be put to this state of affairs. That way lies in the abolition of the system of society which allows one class to riot in wealth while another, the working class, the wealth producing class, lives on a pittance.

Socialism is the solution to your problems and the way to bring it about is by organising in the Socialist Party on the lines set out in THE SOCIALIST STANDARD. There is no other way. And no more headaches for the working class.

W. J. CLARKE
(Socialist Party of Australia.)

A RAMBLE

A ramble to Waltham Abbey from Chingford will take place on Whit-Monday. A party will meet at Liverpool Street Station at 9.30 a.m., catching a train for Chingford at approximately 10 a.m., or soon after. At Chingford Station the main party will gather at 11 a.m. Those wishing to travel to Chingford by other routes from various parts of London can pick up the main party at Chingford Station at 11 a.m. The fare from Liverpool Street is 1s. 1d. Comrades on the east side of London will be able to get to Chingford Station for less. Will all try to make this ramble a success? SOCIAL COMMITTEE.

SOUTHEND

Special Meetings will be held on the Front at Southend on Sunday, June 16th, at 11.30 a.m. and 7.30 p.m.

A party of Comrades will cycle from London to Southend on this date, departing from Aldgate Pump at 9 a.m. sharp, and travelling via Ilford, Romford, Gidea Park and the New Southend Road. Will all those cyclists who wish to make this trip meet at the appointed time and place, or pick up en route? Ilford, 9.30. Romford, 9.50. Gallows Corner, 10 o'clock.

BLOOMSBURY

Lectures will be given on Monday evenings at A.E.U. Hall, 39, Doughty Street (Corner of Guildford Street), W.C.1. at 8.30 p.m.

June 3rd	- "Are United Front Movements Useful?" (Open Discussion)
" 10th	- - - - - No Meeting
" 17th	- "The Battlefields of the Class Struggle" ROBERTUS.
" 24th	- - "The Menace of the Machine" E. HARDY.
July 1st	- - "Profits and the World Crisis" C. LESTOR.

Admission free. All invited. Questions and Discussion.

Should the Workers Buy up Capitalism

THAT a system of society may change its outward form without changing its nature is a fact which the working class are very slow to appreciate. The reforms of the existing system which to a superficial view may seem revolutionary in reality make no change in the basis of society, no change in the relation between the workers and the class which rules them.

The comparatively few workers who are conscious of their position in society know that though reforms may often be described as revolutionary, and though they may bring some temporary benefit for the workers, the subjection of the working class to the interests of the Capitalist class continues. The Capitalist class remains as before in possession of the means to meet human requirements, and the working class, possessing as a class nothing but their labour power, must continue to sell this to those who hold in their grasp the means of life.

The majority of workers and their leaders, however, do not appear to be able to conceive of any change other than within the framework of the existing economic system. They appear to be able to talk and think only in terms of existing institutions. Buying and selling, money-lending, masters and wage-labourers, leaders and led—these and all the other appendages of a class-divided society are regarded as sacrosanct, as being constituent elements of the life of society for all time. The permanence of the class division of society is rarely, and then only vaguely, questioned.

This attitude is characteristic of the Labour Party. Evidence of this contention is to be found in almost every utterance of Labour Party spokesmen. Their obsession with the institutions of Capitalism, leads and directs their political strength to one object only, the reform and perpetuation of Capitalism.

It is not surprising, therefore, to find that a member of the Labour Party who criticises his leaders for endeavouring to conserve the existing order of society, should display the very obsession on which is based the endeavour he deplors.

Fred Longden in "Co-operation and the New Orientation" (published by Ripley Printing Society, Ltd., 2s.) after declaring that he implies no disloyalty to his Party, states (p. 11) that the logical sequence of the Labour Party's legislation is the rehabilitation of what he calls "Newer Capitalism," and the further subjection of the worker. This, he states, represents the "new orientation" of Capitalism, a development to which he is opposed.

"Labour leadership is now composed of men and women who believe that Socialist method consists simply in producing order out of disorder within the orbit of Capitalism itself on a stage,

when conceived as such, on the way to a higher structure as a step towards Socialism" (p. 71). Says Longden, "the constructive side of Labour is fundamentally conservative," and "might be defined as the preservation of the principle of the status of Classism as the only sound and lasting basis of society." And he supports this contention with examples of Labour Party practice and legislation.

The author finds it "hard to believe that the thinking elements in Capitalist political ranks do not see the importance of Labour's rehabilitation legislation. No better means could be found for (1) preserving society from violent revolution; (2) whilst at the same time, preserving the overlordship of the plutocratic few for a century or so" (p. 72).

Yet how far does Longden escape from regarding "Classism" as a "lasting basis" of society? On page 48 he says that "to reverse that position of keeping the toilers subordinated to the non-toilers has been the aim of all true reformers, let alone Socialists." And on page 39 we read: "Socialism means a Republic in which the *working classes* own all *communally essential* land and capital, order their own economic and political life, fix duties and privileges for *all individuals* in the community and determine the kind and manner by which necessities, cultural opportunities and luxuries shall be distributed." (Italics ours.) The working class alone are therefore to own the means of production and fix privileges for all individuals, or, in other words, the working class have only to change places with the Capitalist class and we have Socialism! (Perhaps this changing-place idea is the philosophical expression of the careerism of the Labour Leaders.) Longden provides his own definition of Socialism in order to end the abuse of the word "Socialism," and because (p. 39) "True Socialism has not been defined"; apparently he has never read any Marxian literature, his notion of which is further demonstrated by his use of such confusing terms as "the co-op. Socialism of Owen-to-Marx."

In order to "reverse" the present relation between the Capitalist class and the working class, Longden, like all good co-operators, believes it possible and necessary to compete Capitalism out of existence (p. 67.) There is, however, one departure from the orthodox co-operative policy. Not only are the co-operative societies to play their part in this competition, but also an attempt is to be made to gain a vaguely defined public control of sections of industry, and to use this control to out-rival private enterprise. Why not, says Mr. Longden, let "public authorities" buy up the services that are "going to the dogs" and make them "first-

class and paying concerns." This, he thinks, is "a definite Socialist method which will guarantee a real place for the Co-operative movement" (p. 146). This he regards as the alternative to the "new orientation."

The writer wants what he calls a "real and direct nationalisation," the nationalised industries being allocated to State, Municipal or Co-operative management in accordance with the kind and purpose of the enterprise. And the buying out? Simple! "A guarantee of six per cent. for about 90 years is a grand investment for those who cannot see such returns continuing to come from declining private-enterprise proper." Finally he says (p. 153): "If a bold and honest step were taken along the lines indicated, then a great lead, a grand inspiration and a magnificent hope would result. It would attract the best from all grades in society. . . . It would show faith in Marx's belief that a complete non-violent revolution from Capital-Power to Worker-Power might be possible through constitutional methods in Britain."

The futility of the theory of out-competing Capitalism with the meagre resources at the disposal of the working class, may be demonstrated by the following figures. According to the People's Year Book, 1934, the total share capital of the wholesale and retail co-operative societies is about £150 millions—with reserves perhaps £200 millions. The total wealth of the country at the same date has been estimated at somewhere between £20,000 and £25,000 millions. So that after 70 years the Co-operative movement, in spite of its seven million members, controls only about one-hundredth of the total wealth of the country. Even were the fantastic dream to miraculously come true, there would still be a class of property-owners exploiting a class of wage-labourers. Those who own shares in the Co-operative undertakings are primarily interested in the receipt of their dividends which, like those of any other Capitalist undertaking, are produced only by the exploitation of the workers.

However sincerely Longden may hope that the liberation of the working class will be effected by public authorities and co-operative societies buying-up the productive forces of the world and directing them in the interests of the workers, it remains manifestly true that in a society which is based upon the ownership of the means of living by one class, and the consequent enslavement of the class who are propertyless, such action is prohibited by the conflicting interest of these two classes, the one striving always to protect its property and its power of exploitation, the other striving to release itself from this exploitation.

Those who possess property rights are not going to relinquish them or allow them to be diminished willingly. They may be willing to exchange their capital for the terminable annuities that Mr. Longden proposes to offer, but only if

these annuities were of a value at least, if not more than, equivalent to their existing property, and their power to exploit the propertyless class were to remain therefore undiminished. The Capitalists will not yield one small part of their property rights unless compelled. This compulsion can only be effected by the power of the State, the body at present used by the Capitalist class who have a majority in Parliament, to protect and preserve the institution of private property.

It is clear, therefore, that the first condition for the achievement of Mr. Longden's proposals for the gradual reduction of property rights, is that the majority of the working class shall consciously desire to institute a system of society based upon the common ownership of the means of production, and express that desire by electing to Parliament a majority of members with a clear and definite mandate to realise that object. But as soon as this condition is satisfied, the "buying-up" of Capitalism becomes unnecessary, it will be within the power of the working class to appropriate in the name of the whole of society the whole of the productive machinery, and thus to displace Capitalism by Socialism.

Not only is it impossible to free the working class from wage-slavery by reforming existing Capitalist institutions along the lines suggested by Longden while the majority of the workers desire the perpetuation of private ownership of property, but as soon as this desire ceases to actuate, Capitalism ceases to exist, and all reforms associated with Capitalist institutions become superfluous. Those who work for themselves have no masters and draw no wages. Those who can get all they require without recourse to commerce need no system of exchange, no money. And Parliament, with no property rights to protect, ceases to be an instrument of government, and becomes an instrument of administration; the State, as a coercive machine, once it has been used to achieve Socialism, withers away. In short, all the institutions which seem so important to Mr. Longden, the Labour Party and those of the working class who vote them into Parliament, not only cannot be used to achieve Socialism, but die with the birth of that system of society; just as not so long ago, Feudalism died with the birth of Capitalism, and serfdom was displaced by wage slavery, a slavery to escape from which we ask our fellow workers to organise in the Socialist Party of Great Britain.

THE SOCIALIST PARTY OF NEW ZEALAND

Readers in New Zealand are invited to communicate with the Socialist Party of New Zealand. Secretary, A. W. McMillan, 20, Randwick Crescent, Lower Hutt, where THE SOCIALIST STANDARD, WESTERN SOCIALIST, and all S.P. of G.B. Literature are available.

Economics Class every Tuesday evening, 7.30 p.m., at Market Street, until November. Free to all.

THE SOCIALIST STANDARD

JUNE,



1935

OFFICIAL NOTICE

All communications for the Executive Committee. Subscriptions for the *SOCIALIST STANDARD*, Articles, and Correspondence submitted for insertion therein, should be addressed—The Socialist Party of Great Britain, 42, Great Dover Street, London, S.E.1, to whom Money Orders should be made payable. The meetings of the Executive Committee are held at the Head Office, every Tuesday, at 7.30 p.m.

TERMS OF SUBSCRIPTIONS.

Twelve Months, post free 2s. 6d.
Six Months, post free 1s. 3d.

Peace—in Principle

THE statesmen of Europe are in high feather just now, travelling thousands of miles and engaging in pow-wows, dinners, and triumphal tours that delight the hearts of politicians. And it is all being done in a good cause. Over and over again they point out that they are determined to secure peace, perpetual peace.

Capitalist interests may be what they will, but all representatives are agreed on peace—in principle. That is why they are engaging in such a terrific armament race. Building numerous fast and powerful bombing 'planes. Concluding pacts of mutual support in case of attack. Staging aeroplane attacks on towns and teaching the citizens the art of dodging gas attacks. No expense is grudged in convincing all and sundry of their peaceful intentions.

In the bad old days it was customary to show peaceful intentions by going forth armed with an olive branch. In these enlightened days such things simply are not done. A fleet of aeroplanes armed with several tons of explosive are considered more convincing evidence of a fundamental desire for peace in principle.

The capitalists assert they are too poor to pay workers a wage that will ensure a comfortable existence. Now surely this seems strange when wealth to the value of thousands of millions of pounds is used up providing battleships, tanks, 'planes, guns and the men to man and use them, and the people to minister to these armies of men. And more extraordinary still, all this wealth is simply wasted because none of the powers that be have warlike intentions—at least in principle!

If a recent report is true, and not just a game of bluff, the bulk of what has been spent on armaments in pursuit of peace has been simply thrown away; it has produced just colossal white elephants.

The *Evening News* for May 15th says that a new defensive weapon is reported to have been perfected by a scientist in Bavaria. It consists of a wireless ray of long range and great penetrating power, which can put out of action aeroplanes, tanks and armoured cars. Properly handled, an invisible barrier of rays could be constructed along a frontier which would stop all invading aircraft.

If the report is true the pursuit of peace will change its course and there will be plenty of material for the scrapheap.

In the meantime, however, perhaps workers will awake to the silliness of it all. Peace is only pursued so ferociously because capitalist private property interests have to be served. If there are no capitalists' interests there will be nothing to go to war over. The only way to secure this is to make the means of production the common possession of all. Then we will have peace in fact as well as in principle, and many more human arms and brains to lighten the labour of producing enough to enable all to live comfortably.

The Banking System

THE banking system, as it exists to-day in this country, is not something that at a certain stage in history arose fully developed and in a final form. It has grown slowly and steadily with the progress of capitalism, its growth being most marked in the last hundred years. Its growth has not been a mere matter of increasing size, remarkable as that has been. There has been a steady growth of adaptability to function. What is the function of a banking system? The banking system forms part of the machinery of capitalism and its primary function is to facilitate the investment of new capital. The *Political Dictionary* of 1845 defines a bank as

"a means of facilitating the loan of money from the possessor of money to the farmer or manufacturer who has goods but wants ready money. The lending of money is the operation of banking, and a bank is a centre which facilitates this lending, it enables people to lend through a banker and his connections, who could not lend without that."

In the main that definition is acceptable although, of course, it will not suit pseudo-monetary theorists of to-day. The function of a bank is to accept deposits on the one hand and on the other to make loans or investments with the funds which thus come into its control. The banking system co-ordinates and organises the

activities of the various banks. Before going further it ought to be explained that if nothing has been said about the profit motive, that is only because, throughout, the fundamental principle is assumed that the personal object of all capitalist enterprise is that of profit-making. Here we are not concerned with the personal object but with the social purpose of banking, the primary purpose being that of facilitating the flow of new savings into productive channels. Banks have other functions, but these are ancillary to the main purpose.

For the present this is as much as it is necessary to say about the general principles of banking. Further discussion of the subject will be easier after some account has been given of the component parts of the banking system, and of their inter-relationships.

The Bank of England

The English system of banks forms what may be considered as a hierarchy.

At the top comes the Bank of England, the oldest bank in the country. It occupies a unique position because of three things:

1. It is the note-issuing bank of the country.
2. It is the banker of the Government.
3. It is the banker's bank.

To-day it is usual to describe a bank of which those three statements can be made as a central bank. There is nothing magical about the term central bank as seems sometimes to be supposed. It was rare to find the term used in pre-war banking literature. In Andreade's standard work on the Bank of

England, published in 1909, he describes the Bank of England as "the oldest of the European national banks" and on the few occasions when he speaks of a central bank his meaning is not the present-day one. To say that the Bank of England is the central bank of the country is not to imply that it is a State bank. It is not.

It is a privately-owned institution operating under a charter as are many other companies. The Government does not own a single share, and is not represented on the management of the Bank. In fact, of course, there is a very close connection between the Treasury and the Bank of England, and it is doubtful whether the Bank would take any action in a matter of major importance without prior consultation with the Treasury. The close contact between the Treasury and the Bank is the consequence of the Bank's being the Government's banker.

What is meant by that? In the first place it means that all the Government's banking accounts are kept with the Bank, secondly the Bank handles the Government debt. If the Government issues a new loan, those who wish to subscribe to it make their application to the Bank of England. Every week the Government borrows money for a period of three months by issuing bills, known as Treasury Bills. Those bills are issued and, at maturity, redeemed through the Bank of England. It will be easily appreciated that

as the banker of the Government the Bank of England is in an important and powerful position. The importance of that position is further enhanced by the fact that it is the banker's bank. By this

THE SOCIALIST PARTY OF GREAT BRITAIN

OBJECT.—The establishment of a system of society based upon the common ownership and democratic control of the means and instruments for producing and distributing wealth by and in the interest of the whole community.

DECLARATION OF PRINCIPLES

THE SOCIALIST PARTY of Great Britain HOLDS—

1. That society as at present constituted is based upon the ownership of the means of living (i.e., land, factories, railways, etc.) by the capitalist or master class, and the consequent enslavement of the working class, by whose labour alone wealth is produced.
2. That in society, therefore, there is an antagonism of interests, manifesting itself as a class struggle, between those who possess but do not produce, and those who produce but do not possess.
3. That this antagonism can be abolished only by the emancipation of the working class from the domination of the master class, by the conversion into the common property of society of the means of production and distribution, and their democratic control by the whole people.
4. That as in the order of social evolution the working class is the last class to achieve its freedom, the emancipation of the working class will involve the emancipation of all mankind without distinction of race or sex.
5. That this emancipation must be the work of the working class itself.
6. That as the machinery of government, including the armed forces of the nation, exists only to conserve the monopoly by the capitalist class of the wealth taken from the workers, the working class must organise consciously and politically for the conquest of the powers of government, national and local, in order that this machinery, including these forces, may be converted from an instrument of oppression into the agent of emancipation and the overthrow of privilege, aristocratic and plutocratic.
7. That as all political parties are but the expression of class interests, and as the interest of the working class is diametrically opposed to the interests of all sections of the master class, the party seeking working-class emancipation must be hostile to every other party.
8. THE SOCIALIST PARTY of Great Britain, therefore, enters the field of political action determined to wage war against all other political parties, whether alleged labour or avowedly capitalist, and calls upon the members of the working class of this country to muster under its banner to the end that a speedy termination may be wrought to the system which deprives them of the fruits of their labour, and that poverty may give place to comfort, privilege to equality, and slavery to freedom.

Those agreeing with the above principles and desiring enrolment in the Party should apply for membership form to secretary of nearest branch or at Head Office.

is meant that the clearing banks keep their reserves, apart from the relatively small portion held as currency in their own tills, in the form of deposits with the Bank of England. This is an implied recognition by the other banks of the paramount position of the Bank of England. They keep their reserves in this form because they know, or at least believe, that if at any time they should require to increase their holdings of currency they can obtain cash from the Bank of England by drawing on their deposits. The Bank of England, therefore, is the repository of the final reserves of the banking system. The third factor which makes for the importance of the Bank of England is that it is the note-issuing bank of the country. This is not to say that it is the only note-issuing bank in the country. It is not. Certain of the Scotch and Irish banks have the right to, and do, issue notes, but their issues have only a limited local circulation and are relatively small. To-day when apart from token coins, which have very restricted rights of legal tender, the whole currency of the country consists of Bank of England notes, the note-issuing powers of the Bank are of particular significance. It is therefore worth while spending a little time considering the note issue.

The Note Issue

In 1694, when the Bank of England was established as a means of raising money for the King, it was thought that the secret of profit-making in banking was to be able to issue notes. In consideration of a loan to the Government of £1,200,000 a newly-formed company, with a capital of this amount was granted the right to issue notes up to the amount of the capital which had been lent to the Government. Not until 1833 were Bank of England notes declared to be legal tender. At first the Bank had no monopoly of note issue, but in 1742, when the Bank's charter was renewed, it was made illegal for any partnership of more than six people to issue notes payable on demand. It is interesting to note that the Act of 1742 definitely stated that there was conferred on the Bank the privilege of "exclusive banking," which shows quite clearly that at that time it was thought that the profitability of banking arose from issuing notes. After 1742 other firms in the country continued to issue notes, but they were all small firms consisting of less than six partners. In 1826 the position was altered and banks with any number of partners, if established sixty-five miles from London, were authorised to issue notes. In 1844 by an Act known as the Bank Charter Act, the position of the Bank as a note-issuing institution was laid down on lines which have been maintained ever since. The Bank was divided into two departments, an Issue Department and a Banking Department. Notes were to be issued by the Issue Department which had to hold full gold cover for all notes issued beyond a certain amount. The

portion of the issue against which the Bank need not hold gold is what is known as the fiduciary issue. In 1844 the fiduciary issue was £14,000,000; by 1914 it had risen to £19,450,000. During the war and early post-war years there was a further small increase to £19,750,000.

When, in 1928, the Bank took over the Treasury note issue the fiduciary issue was raised to £260,000,000. Except for a temporary increase to £275,000,000 between September, 1931, and April, 1933, the fiduciary issue has been maintained at £260,000,000 ever since. By the Act of 1844 the Bank was compelled to buy standard gold at £3 17s. 9d. per ounce, so that after the passing of this Act the legal position was that anyone could exchange gold for notes, or notes for gold at the Bank of England at a fixed rate. In 1925 the position was somewhat modified, and gold could only be obtained from the Bank in minimum quantities of 400 ounces. In 1931 the Bank was released from the obligation to redeem its notes in gold on demand. England was "off the gold standard." Up to 1928 the increase in the Bank of England's note issue represented an increase in the Bank's holding of gold. In that year, however, the Bank's note issue rose from £181,000,000 to £419,000,000 as a consequence of the Bank's taking over the responsibility for the Treasury notes issued by the Government during the war and early post-war years. Here it might be worth drawing attention to the fact, on which there are frequent misconceptions, that the £1 and 10s. notes which originated with the war were not bank notes. They were issued on behalf of the Government by the Treasury, and, except indirectly, the Bank of England had nothing to do with them. Now, however, that the Treasury and Bank note issues have been amalgamated, the Bank of England is responsible for practically the whole currency of the country. Its power over the currency is a restricted one and even to-day, when the gold standard is suspended, the Bank cannot issue notes beyond the fiduciary issue, unless it receives the full legal gold equivalent. It may be asked how do notes get issued?

The following will serve as an illustration. One of the South African mining companies sells, say, £100,000 gold bullion to the bank in S. Africa, which sends it to London to the Bank of England, when it is received by the Banking Department. The Banking Department credits the S. African bank in its books with £100,000. The gold it delivers to the Issue Department against Bank Notes for £100,000. The position then, is that the Issue Department has issued £100,000 more notes and has an equivalent increase in its holding of bullion, while the Banking Department has reserved £100,000 of notes against which it is liable to the S. African Bank for £100,000. The notes get into circulation as they are withdrawn out of the Banking Department by depositors. The notes held by the

Banking Department constitute its reserves, for they alone are available to meet the claims of customers on the Bank who want cash. The Bank, as holder of the final reserves of the country, has to pay particular attention to the size of its reserves. For its own safety and in the general interest it has to seek to ensure that it can meet any demands for cash made on it. How it does that will be discussed later. Immediately it is desired to say a few words about the other members of the banking hierarchy.

The Clearing Banks

Next to the Bank of England come the Clearing Banks. There are ten in number, the most important being Midland Bank, Barclays Bank, National Provincial Bank, Westminster Bank and Lloyds Bank—the big five, as they are called. The clearing banks are public joint stock concerns receiving funds on deposit from customers and using those funds to make loans, buy bills (that is, promises to pay specified sums after fairly short periods of, say, three or four months) and other investments, such as gilt-edged securities.

Just as the clearing banks keep their balances with the Bank of England, so do the other banks, in the main, keep their balances with the clearing banks. The clearing banks are so called because they are members of what is known as the clearing system. This is a system designed to simplify the settlement of accounts between the banks. Every day the Midland Bank receives from its customers a mass of cheques drawn on, say, Barclays Bank, while Barclays, on the other hand, receives a mass of cheques from its customers drawn on the Midland Bank. If Barclays made an individual collection of cash in respect of each cheque it received drawn on the Midland Bank, and *vice versa*, there would be an immense amount of useless shifting backwards and forwards of cash between the two banks. To avoid this, the clearing system was set up. Every day, clerks from the clearing banks meet and work out the positions of the banks. Payments due to the Midland in respect of the cheques drawn on Barclays are offset against payments due from it in respect of cheques held by Barclays. After the accounts have been worked out this way any amount due from one bank to another is settled by a transfer in the books of the Bank of England.

Not all the joint stock banks are members of the clearing system, and those that are not maintain accounts with the clearing banks as do the remaining members of the Banking System, the private banks, the acceptance houses and the discount houses. The private banks are few in number. They are banking firms, whose capital is privately held—that is to say, the shares are not dealt in on the Stock Exchange—and who do not set out to attract the general public as depositors. They have a restricted circle of clients and usually specialise

in certain lines of business. An acceptance house is a banking firm, usually of foreign origin, which specialises in accepting bills. That is to say, it will promise to pay a bill drawn by some other party at some future date. It will make a charge for giving this promise—lending its name as the process is called, and will expect to be provided by the party on whose behalf the promise was given with funds to meet the bill before the due date. The name of an acceptance house on a bill is a form of guarantee that it will be paid on the due date. It can, therefore, be turned into cash, or discounted, as it is called, more cheaply than would otherwise be possible. It should be mentioned that between the non-clearing joint stock banks, the private banks and the acceptance houses it is not possible to draw clear-cut lines of division. A firm like Hambros Bank, for example, is a public joint stock bank; it is not on the clearing, it does a large acceptance business and has many features in common with a private bank. Rothschilds is a private bank and one of the leading acceptance houses.

The discount houses consist of three public joint stock companies and a number of private partnerships and firms. Their business is that of discounting bills. That is to say, they are prepared to give cash here and now for a bill which falls due, say, in three months. Of course, they will only give something less than the face value of the bill; the amount they deduct is known as the discount, and when it is expressed in terms of £100 bill and for a period of a year that is the rate of discount. The discount houses obtain most of the funds with which they discount bills by borrowing, on security, from the joint stock banks, the private banks and the acceptance houses. Their profit is represented by the difference between the rate of interest charged by the banks for the money lent and the rate they (the discount houses) charge for discounting bills. The rate charged by the banks for loans to the discount houses will be immediately determined by the amount of funds the banks have available to lend, and the demand for those funds. If the banks have large sums to lend, when borrowing is restricted, competition between the banks will force the rate down. On the other hand, if a large volume of bills are being discounted at a time when the banks are not in a position to increase their loans the rate for loans and of discount will rise. It may happen that at a certain time the discount houses cannot obtain from the usual sources sufficient funds to finance all the bills they have discounted. Under such circumstances they have recourse to the Bank of England.

The Bank Rate

On Thursday of each week the Bank of England fixes what is known as the Bank Rate, which is the rate at which it is prepared to discount first-

class bills. This is the most important rate in the country. By the movement of the Bank Rate the Bank of England seeks to conserve the Banking System and to direct banking policy. If the Bank Rate rises other rates will, sooner or later, rise, and *vice versa*. A rise in interest rates charged to borrowers and allowed to depositors will tend to discourage borrowing and encourage the making of deposits. Conversely, a lowering of rates will tend to encourage borrowing and discourage depositing. This is important, first, from the domestic aspect of internal borrowing and depositing, and secondly, from the aspect of the external value, that is to say, the exchange ratio between the currency and foreign currencies. If the Bank Rate rises and other rates follow suit it will become more attractive to somebody in, say, New York, to send funds to London for investment. This will lead to the buying of sterling and the selling of dollars, which will mean a rise in the market quotation of sterling in terms of dollars.

The Currency Cranks

This account of the Banking System has, of necessity, failed to deal with many important points, but it should have made clear the two fundamental features. The first, that the banks constitute a hierarchy, and secondly, that the essential business of an ordinary bank is the accepting of deposits and the utilisation of the funds so obtained from depositors to make loans and investments. In recent years two schools of monetary theories have arisen who have stood banking theory on its head. For them banks do not lend and invest what is deposited with them, but rather lend and invest first so that their deposits result from the loans, etc., made by them. This is the theory that "every bank loan creates a deposit." There are two schools of thought based on this. Firstly, that of the "credit creationists," like Major Douglas, and secondly, those economists who think that trade booms and depressions are due to monetary causes, and that they could be eradicated by a properly adjusted banking policy.

The credit creationists have nowhere and on no occasion produced anything beyond their unsupported and absurd assertions to prove that banks can create something out of nothing.

The other school of monetary theorists who attribute to banks supernatural powers are not guilty of the crudities of Major Douglas and his school. They do not claim that banks create anything in the sense of real purchasing power, but they do maintain that bank deposits originate in bank loans and investments, and that changes in the volume of these deposits are therefore under the control of the banks. They further maintain that prices are a function of the volume of bank deposits (or of bank deposits and currency taken

together), and that therefore bank policy can control the price level. This theory they link up with another theory, which ascribes changes in business activity to movements in the price level, and they argue that banks by a proper policy and regulation of deposits can prevent the periodic crises of capitalism, stabilise business conditions and make capitalism function smoothly. It would take too long to argue the whole case against the theory that booms and depressions are produced by monetary causes, but it may be pointed out that all "credit creationists" in the final analysis base their case on the use of cheques and the existence of the clearing system. Now, before cheques were generally used, or a clearing system existed, prices rose and fell, and capitalism was shaken by depressions. As for the claim that prices are a function of bank deposits, all the evidence is against it. In recent years prices have fallen, despite the rise in deposits. Further, the volume of deposits could be altered considerably by changes in habits which would not affect prices. For example, about £70 million is deposited with building societies. If the depositors all withdrew their deposits from the societies and put them with banks who then put £70 million with the building societies, bank deposits would be £70 million more than they are at present, but does anyone imagine that prices would be in any way affected? B. S.

THIS MONTH'S QUOTATION

The quotation is from an article by the late T. E. Shaw ("Lawrence of Arabia"), published in the *Evening Standard*, May 20th, 1935. The article was written by Lawrence, at a recent date, in reply to a joking request that he should write a memoir to be filed away against his death. Here, as on other occasions, Lawrence stressed the view, learned by his own experience, "that progress to-day is made, not by the single genius, but by the common effort."

"To me it is the multitude of rough transport drivers filling all the roads of England every night, who make this the mechanical age. And it is the airmen, the mechanics, who are overcoming the air, not the Mollisons or Orlebars. The genius raids, but the common people occupy and possess."

NEW PREMISES

A Meeting of Party Members will take place on Saturday, 15th June, at Head Office, at 7 p.m., to consider ways and means of raising funds for larger premises.

Dr. Edwin Cannan

ON April 8th, Dr. Edwin Cannan died at the age of seventy-four. From 1907, until his retirement in 1926, he was Professor of Political Economy at the University of London. He was the author of numerous books on Economics, of which the two most important were perhaps *Theories of Production and Distribution* (1893) and *A Review of Economic Theory* (1929). In those two books he made a very penetrating analysis of the English economists from Adam Smith to Marshall, and at the same time indicated, by inference, the main lines of his own economic theories. It is significant that *The Times*, in its obituary notice, mentioned neither this latter work, which contains a criticism of Marshall, the founder of the dominant school of economic thought, nor his *Currency and the Regulation of its Value* (193), in which he opposed the popular views on banking and credit.

Dr. Cannan was neither a member of, nor a sympathiser with, the party: why then should we bother to record his passing? It is because we feel that, as an economist, he was of more than usual significance in the development of economic thought. During his life he did not receive the recognition he deserved. He did not court reputation. He was more concerned with expounding economic truths, as he saw them, even if they were unpopular. We think, however, that his work will last when that of others more nimble of wit and glib of tongue has been forgotten.

His particular significance for us lies in the fact that he was the first economist after Marx whose thought was conditioned by the realisation that production and distribution take place within a social framework "resulting from private property and free labour." This enabled him to resolve the muddle into which the discussion of the problems of production and distribution had been reduced by the economists of the nineteenth century.

The Classical Economists, starting from Adam Smith, based their theories of production and distribution on the existence of three agents of production—Land, Labour and Capital. They then divided income into three classes, corresponding to these three agents of production: Rent—the income from Land; Wages—the income from Labour; and Profit—the income from Capital. Later Profit came to be divided into two parts, one called Profits, which was supposed to represent the "earnings of management," the other Interest, representing the return in respect of "the passive ownership of property." Dr. Cannan saw through the artificiality of all divisions of this kind and based his theory of distribution on "the division between earnings of Labour as a whole on the one side and the income derived from property, whether rent, quasi-

rent, interest or anything else taken as a whole on the other side." This was the division already made by Marx.

The War caused Dr. Cannan to turn more and more to the consideration of monetary theory, and here again his views come to have a close affinity with those of Marx, particularly his views on banking and credit. He opposed vigorously the popular theory that banks create credit. In *THE SOCIALIST STANDARD* for April there will be found references to his writings on this subject. He was very appreciative of the Party's attitude, and in a letter to the writer, in which he referred to the articles on Banks and Credit which appeared in *THE SOCIALIST STANDARD* towards the end of 1933, he wrote: "The reigning money school pronounce me a lunatic on the subject of banks, and it is gratifying to know that there is at least one other person in the world who shares my view. R. (he refers to a well-known monetary economist) recently said my view was a mystery to him, whereas it has always seemed to me that all the mystery was made by him and his friends making bankers' debts to their customers into a sort of substance which the banks create out of nothing. One would think that all recent experience was enough to knock out for ever the idea that increase of deposits raises commodity prices, and that commodity prices can be regulated by shifting bank rates up and down."

Perhaps the most typical feature of his economic thought was his refusal to force his theories into nationalistic moulds. He saw that national rivalries and national barriers were impediments in the way of a full utilisation of the productive resources of society and did not hesitate to point out that "no one, so far as I know, has ever contended that the pursuit of self-interest by individual States tends invariably to the common good of the whole."

In a brief note, such as this, it is not possible to do justice to all his contributions to economic thought, but it must be pointed out that he was practically the only well-known economist in this country who kept his head in 1931 and refused to subscribe to the revival of the eighteenth century mercantilist theories regarding the balance of trade with which stunt journalists and politicians scared the public.

Independence of thought, and simple directness of statement were the two chief characteristics of his writings. Both of these features are too rare in contemporary economists. The world of economic thought is the poorer for his passing, and popular error and superstition more free to parade unchecked. B.S.

"SOCIALISM AND RELIGION"

48 pages. TWOPENCE 2½d. post free.

Women's Freedom

HOW many of the slaves who sing with swelling breast that "Britons never never" ever give thought to what they mean by freedom. It is a word that is given a different interpretation as many times as it is used. Thus the capitalist free trader desires freedom to sell his goods in every market of the world regardless of the fettered millions who have produced them. Freedom to him means freedom to trade and make profit. The so-called free worker under capitalism finds that his freedom leaves him free to starve when he cannot find a boss. The "down and out" under a recent Act of Parliament is now free to sleep under the stars without incurring the wrath of the powers that be and without the doubtful hospitality of a police cell that used to be free to him. The suffragettes fought for the freedom of the vote so that they could have their say in the laws governing their property. The position of millions of working class women who had no property and were, in fact, bound hand and foot by their economic dependence upon the employer directly or upon some employed male relative did not rouse the ire of the suffragettes. Obtaining the vote has done nothing to alter that. Only when working class women learn their true position in society will they know how to use their vote wisely, and for this the suffragette movement had no time. Wilberforce, who was the champion of the black slaves' freedom, was one of the stoutest supporters of the combination laws which forbade trade unions and were designed to keep the white slaves of this country in subjection. The pious utterances of the dealers in cant and humbug stand for nought when we discover how far their principles of freedom take them. The Labour Party, the self-styled champion of the poor and oppressed, supported when in office the killing of natives who were misguided enough to believe that they, too, were fighting for their native freedom. The Labour Party soon taught them, however, that there is no such thing as freedom when capitalist interests are at stake.

Truly "it is a mad world, my masters," but there are none so mad as the members of the working class who will not use their one freedom, their freedom to think and act in their own interests. The freedom upon which all freedom rests is the economic freedom of a class in society from the domination of another class.

This freedom is the object of the Socialist Party of Great Britain, and is the only freedom worth fighting for, because it embraces all liberty that is possible for all mankind without distinction of race or sex. Working class women as well as men will find their political expression in the S.P.G.B. The so-called woman question is no different from any other working class problem. Working women are either in economic bondage

to an employer or to their husbands, and Socialism ends both states of bondage. The petty tyrannies of domestic life are often the shadows of those in the industrial world. The worker eats, sleeps, and takes his leisure at the dictates of his job. His life is moulded round his job. In other words, while producing everything worth while in life his ability to enjoy life is regulated by the meagre amount of wages he receives. The man, then, should regard his wife as a partner and as a comrade to let off as lightly as possible and with whom to fight jointly against capitalism. Instead of this he sometimes assumes in his turn the role of master and initiates a fresh set of petty tyrannies. It is useless for women to fight against these various effects of the one great evil. They must break the economic stranglehold which holds the man, and they can only do this by breaking the economic stranglehold of capitalism upon the whole of the working class. On, then, with the fight for freedom, but let us first realise what we mean by freedom.

Primitive society knew no private ownership in the means of production. Nor will Socialism. The means and instruments for producing wealth must be the common property of the whole of society. It will then be out of the power of any person to coerce by threat or promise of material gain, any other person. Personal property suited to the taste and needs of individuals remains untouched, and fresh supplies being always available nobody will covet anybody's things, nor want to hoard up supplies for themselves. Freedom for the first time will be effectively realised and break its own shackles. The worker must first, however, use the faculty that he proudly claims distinguishes him from the brute. He must stage an intelligent revolt against the conditions that keep him as dull as a cow in a field. Then will he become really free.

MRS. O.

ARMAMENTS—'WHATEVER THE COST'

All over the world the ruling class are buying armaments—but "cannot afford" to better the condition of the workers. On Wednesday, 22nd May, the Minister for Air, Lord Londonderry, spoke in the House of Lords about the new programme of aircraft building. Unofficial estimates place the aggregate cost at £60 millions, but if the Government think it necessary the preliminary plans will be further extended. Hear Lord Londonderry:—

"If the new programme proves insufficient we will increase it whatever the cost in money or effort."

The following day in the House of Commons a Labour M.P. proposed increasing old age pensions from 10s. to 15s. The Chancellor of the Exchequer turned it down.

Straws

A Rotten Case.

"The possibility of a new workers' party being formed, with the I.L.P. and the Communist Party as the central core, was one not of the distant future. It was, in fact, very near to them." Thus Maxton, at recent I.L.P. Conference. Harry Pollitt, "fraternal delegate" from C.P. following, announced that his party was "ready and willing to achieve the creation of a mass united Communist Party, affiliated to the Communist International."

Whither Maxton?

How this view of "mass" swallowing was regarded by Maxton is not stated. Future developments will be interesting to follow. The "picturesque personality," personally popular (according to parliamentary reporters in the Sunday Press) with Conservatives in the House, will hardly consent to play second fiddle to tenth-rate performers in the Anglo-Moscow band.

Dark Diplomacy.

Meanwhile, headquarters of the "Communist International" has been demonstrating how to "lead" the workers to Socialism. You beflag Moscow like Limehouse on Eden's visit, you toast the King, you goose-step the Red Army—but only to throw dust in the eyes of the British master-class... until that humourless periodical, *The Labour Monthly*, incontinently gives the game away.

"Soviet diplomacy undoubtedly made a most brilliant use of this opportunity—including plenty of bunting and drinking the King's health—to win whatever sections in Britain could be won against the anti-Soviet war-plans." (*Palme Dutt*, May, 1935.)

"Bloody Cesspools" of Passchendale.

A recent review in the *Daily Herald* called attention to Lloyd George's exposure of Haig's Passchendale exploit, where the "plan was a folly" and "the crime was the obstinacy with which Haig continued to fling his heroic battalions into the bloody cesspool." It records the fact that Lloyd George himself, however, sent a letter to Haig, congratulating him on the "skill, courage and pertinacity which have commanded the grateful admiration of the British Empire."

The Labour Party in 1914.

The reviewer fails to point out that behind Lloyd George was the enthusiastic backing of the Labour Party, whose whole organisation had been placed at the disposal of the Government on the

outbreak of war, whose own "Uncle Arthur" signed a joint appeal with Bonar Law and Lloyd George to householders to urge kith and kin to partake in any and every war activity for the glory of God and the preservation of the British capitalist class.

Morrison's "Socialism."

"On the ability, quality and idealism of our party, including particularly its public representatives, will depend enormously the success of Socialism." (Herbert Morrison, May 13th, 1935.) "Socialism" to the leader of the London Labour Party means "public ownership" of the London Passenger Transport Board type, "efficient" working of "public services." The "idealism" would seem to include a resolute endeavour to keep down the rates, for "We know that if we go too far in expenditure, we shall be turned out at the next election." (*Daily Herald*, October 3rd, 1934. Italics our own.) Vote-catching has always been the main object of Labourism.

Consecrated Lick-Spitting.

The Archbishop of Canterbury relates that, shortly after the visit of the King and Queen recently, to the widow of a victim of a colliery explosion, she said to him, with tears in her eyes: "I could not help kissing the floor where she had stood." It must be admitted that the capitalist class has played the Queen for all it is worth. The Red Pawn game of the Socialist Party will eventually cry "Mate" on the political field. . . . The pawns will be alive, consciously working towards the End, inevitably marked out by Economic Circumstance. (See No. 6, *Declaration of Principles*.)

Shelley Speaking!

Percy Bysshe Shelley, not unknown in the highest realm of Poesy, claims space in THE SOCIALIST STANDARD. Written over a hundred years ago, the principle enunciated still stands:—

"The power which has increased is the power of the rich. The name and office of King is merely the mask of this power, and is a kind of stalking-horse used to conceal these 'catchers of men' whilst they lay their nets. Monarchy is only the string which ties the robber's bundle." (*A Philosophical View of Reform*, 1820.)

Compensation.

And the question of "Compensation" when the robber's bundle is untied will be quite irrelevant, as irrelevant as "compensation" for the sweat and agony of the long ages of Wage-Slavedom.

REGINALD.

Open Air Meetings

Sundays:

Finsbury Park	6 p.m.	Church Lane, Tooting	11.30 a.m.
Regents Park	11.30 a.m.	Park Avenue, Longbridge Road (nr. Barking	
Clapham Common	6 p.m.	Park)	8 p.m.
Avenue Road, Clock Tower, Lewisham ...	8 p.m.	Whipps Cross	7.30 p.m.
Ridley Road, Dalston	8 p.m.	Brockwell Park	6 p.m.
Victoria Park	5 p.m.	Cock Hotel	8 p.m.
Queens Road, Bayswater	8 p.m.	Southend Sea Front (commencing June 30th) ...	6 p.m.

Mondays:

Ridley Road, Dalston, E.8 8 p.m.

Tuesdays:

Clissold Corner, Albion Road, N.16 8 p.m.

Wednesdays:

Deanery Road, Water Lane, Stratford 8 p.m. Windsor Road, Forest Gate, E. 8 p.m.
Hackney Town Hall 8 p.m.

Thursdays:

Ridley Road, Dalston, E.8. 8 p.m. "Salmon and Ball," Bethnal Green, E. 8 p.m.

Saturdays:

London Rd., Wembley (nr. L.M.S. Stn.), High Rd. 7.30 p.m. Ilford Station 8 p.m.
Jolly Butchers Hill 8 p.m.

BRANCH DIRECTORY

BATTERSEA.—Sec., 2, Hanbury Road, S.W.14. Branch meets Thursday, 8.30 p.m., at The Waiting Room, Latchmere Baths, entrance in Burns Road.

BIRMINGHAM.—Sec., E. Jasper, 38, Rollason Road, Erdington, Branch meets Jeans Café, Newton Street. First Wednesday in month at 8 p.m.

BLOOMSBURY.—Branch meets every Monday at 7.30 p.m., at A.E.U. Hall, 39, Doughty Street, W.C. (Near Grays Inn, Road.) Sec., Miss B. Foster, 11, Regent Square, W.C.1.

CENTRAL.—Membership obtained only through the Ex. Committee. Applications to General Sec.

CHISWICK.—(See West London).

DAGENHAM.—Sec. H. Berry, 5, Cannington Road, Dagenham. Branch meets alternate Saturdays (from 15th June) at above address. Discussion after branch business.

ECCLES.—Branch meets 1st and 3rd Mondays in month at Railway Temperance Room, Four Bridges, Wellington Road, 7.30 p.m. Lecture and discussion, 8.45. Non-members invited. Secretary, Mrs. F. LEA, 5, Gaskell Road, Eccles, Lancs.

EDINBURGH.—Communications to Sec., D. Lamond, at 15, Barclay Place.

GLASGOW.—Branch meets every Tuesday at 7.30 p.m. at McLean Memorial Hall, Salt Market, Glasgow. Communications to T. N. Walshe, c/o Falconer, 100, Naburn Street, C.5.

HACKNEY.—Branch meets Friday, 7.30 p.m., at Old Gravel Pit Hall, Vallette Street, E.9. Lecture after each meeting. Communication to Sec., E. Chalkley, 21, Bridge Street, E.9.

ILFORD.—Branch meets Mondays at 8 p.m. at 142, Richmond Road. Discussion after Branch business. Communications to Sec., at above address.

ISLINGTON.—All communications to F. W., 92, Wellington Road, Holloway, N.2. Branch meets on Fridays at 8 to 10.30 p.m., at Room 4, Co-operative Hall, 129, Seven Sisters Road, N.

LEYTON.—Communications to Sec., Dick Jacobs, 12, Clifford Rd., Walthamstow, E.17. Branch meets Thursday, 8 p.m., at Trades Hall, Grove House, High Road, Leyton.

LEWISHAM.—Branch meets Thursdays, at 8 p.m., at The Anchor Club Room, Lewisham Road. Sec. N. Taylor, 5, Hawke Road, Upper Norwood, S.E.19.

MANCHESTER.—Branch meets fortnightly (Mondays) as from 14 Jan., at Craigwell Restaurant, Peter Street (entrance in South Street). Sec., B. A. Lee, 19, Emery Avenue, Chorlton, Manchester.

PADDINGTON.—Branch meeting held on 2nd Friday, and lecture with discussion on 4th Friday in each month, 8 p.m., in the guild room over "Co-op. Stores," 447, Harrow Road, W.10. Literature Sec., W. Veal, 73, Wornington Road, W.10.

ROMFORD.—Branch meets alternate Tuesdays at 8 p.m. commencing February 5th (open to public) at N.U.R. Club, Albert Road. Business followed by Lecture and discussion. Secy. P. Golding, "Basra," Boscombe Ave., Hornchurch.

SHEFFIELD.—Sec., G. H. Southey, 112, Pickering Road, Sheffield, 3. Branch meets alternate Mondays, 7.30 p.m. at Room 2, A.E.U. Institute, Stanley Street.

SOUTHEND-ON-SEA.—Branch meets 1st and 3rd Wednesday in the month, at 8 p.m. at 6, Hermitage Road, Westcliff. Discussion after branch business. Non-members invited. Communications to Sec. at above address.

SOUTHWARK.—Branch meets Fridays at 8 p.m., 42, Great Dover St., S.E.1. Communications to Sec., at above address.

STEPNEY.—Sec., S. Goldstein, 18, Irene House, Flower & Dene Street, Stepney, E.1. Branch meets on Fridays, at 8 p.m., at Working Lads Institute (nr. Whitechapel Station).

TOOTING.—Branch meets 1st Sunday in the month, at 12 o'clock noon, at "The Springfield Social Club," 590, Garrett Lane, S.W.17. (Opposite Burntwood Lane). Sec., 174, Haydons Road, S. Wimbledon, S.W.19.

TOTTENHAM.—Branch meets 1st and 3rd Fridays in the month, 7, Bruce Grove, Room 2. Discussion after branch business. Public invited. Communications to C. Godfrey, 49, Napier Road, Tottenham, N.17.

WEST HAM.—Sec., P. Hallard, 22, Colegrave Road, Stratford, E. Branch meets Whitehall Schools, Parliament Place, Forest Gate, every Thursday at 8 p.m.

WEST LONDON (Chiswick).—Branch meets Fridays, 8 p.m., at Chiswick Club, over 376, High Road, Chiswick, W.4. Communications to Sec., C. Curtis, 52, Parkstead Road, Putney, S.W.15.

WEMBLEY.—Communications to H. G. Holt, 28, Charterhouse Avenue, Wembley, Middlesex. Branch meets every Friday at 8 p.m., at Cafe-Restaurant, over 170, High Road, Wembley. Discussion after branch business.

WOOD GREEN.—Communications to Sec. at 44, Boreham Road, Wood Green, N.22. Branch meets 2nd and 4th Wednesday in month at 8.30 p.m., Stirling House, Stuart Crescent.

THE SOCIALIST STANDARD

The Official Organ of **THE SOCIALIST PARTY** of Great Britain.

*Unity in . .
essentials is
the only . .
basis of . .
sound . . .
organisation*

No. 371. Vol. 31]

London, July, 1935

[Monthly, Twopence

This "Honours" Business

THE award of honours to prominent trade union officials, Messrs. Pugh, Citrine and Edwards, is of sufficient importance to call for comment. It mirrors the attitude of mind of the trade union movement on the one side and of the ruling class on the other. It is a by-product of the crisis and of the uneasiness of our masters in face of international difficulties.

When war broke out in 1914 the British capitalists knew that they were facing a situation full of danger for themselves. If the German capitalists' appeal to arms were to succeed the flow of wealth derived from the exploitation of the black, yellow and white workers of the Empire would be re-directed to the advantage of the German capitalist victors.

ON OTHER PAGES

	Page
The Future of Palestine	162
Notes by the Way ...	164
Notes of the Month ...	166
Meetings, Lectures and Discussions ...	167
Let Us Now Praise Famous Men ...	168
Materialism as a Taboo	169
Strike Riots in Rhodesia ...	171
Lady Snowden Finds Us a Mission ...	172
Straws ...	173
Books Reviewed ...	174

To overcome the danger the British Government had dire need of the unstinted support of the working class. To secure it they called in the trade union and Labour leaders, gave them office, pay, honours and flattery, and got in return a sufficiently docile working class, content to die for capitalism and be enthusiastic

about it. There was, of course, a minority who were never misled, but the majority was large enough to serve the capitalist purpose. Shortly after the war, in 1921-22, there came another crisis for capitalism—an economic crisis. Again the trade union officials and Labour leaders played their part in smoothing things over and restraining their followers. Then, in 1924, a Labour Government was allowed to function on a short lead, as an instrument for securing an adjustment of foreign relationships, particularly with Germany. When that was finished, out it went. In 1926 the workers, against the advice of their leaders, came out on strike as a spontaneous gesture of sympathy with the miners. This time capitalism preferred fighting to negotiation, so the labour leaders were not wanted, and were hardly even allowed to save their faces.

A few years later, in 1931, capitalism had another economic crisis. Again it was necessary to have the workers won over, or, failing that, to have them confused and divided.

MacDonald, Snowden, Thomas, etc., responded to the capitalist call for aid and enabled capitalism to solve its problem cheaply and expeditiously. Now we come down to 1935 and the distribution of knighthoods to the trade union inner circle. What is capitalism's problem now? and why does it not continue to make use of tried and trusty turn-coats like MacDonald? The answer to the second question is a simple one. To be of use to the other side a leader must be a man of commanding influence and popularity, otherwise his defection will not serve the desired purpose of destroying his party. But once the desertion has taken place, the influence and popularity steadily diminish.

MacDonald and Thomas in the past four years have become less and less influential with the working class. So the exit of MacDonald from the premiership coincides with the advancement of his former associates—who are now his opponents—to the honour of titles.

And what is the crisis for which capitalism requires working class aid this time? The answer is no doubt to be found in the re-arming of Germany and her demand for the restoration of colonies. If the British Government should want to take a strong line in the councils of the international capitalist banditry it may again require the support and sacrifice of the British working class, so again it uses the time-honoured device of seeking to nobble the leaders.

Doubtless the men concerned do not see it that way. They either do not see anything—although one would have supposed that Mr. Citrine for example could realise the helpless position in which he is placing himself—or else they honestly believe it is their duty to support English capitalism against Nazi capitalism. It matters little which attitude is really theirs. The result is the same in either case, and it spells disaster for the working class. Working class interests require that the workers shall line up as one solid body *against* capitalism and capitalist Governments everywhere, and *for* Socialism at all times and in all places. Even on the short view, looking only at the question

of the danger of war, the international standpoint is the soundest common sense. The Governments in every country, when seeking the support of their own working class for some policy of national defence and war, invariably stress the alleged unity of workers and capitalists abroad as an excuse for strong armaments at home. The only answer to that is for Socialists to seize every opportunity of making known their own untarnished independence and loyalty to Socialism. Nothing will so dishearten internationally-inclined workers in Germany, France and elsewhere as the impression that Socialism in Great Britain has sold out to the capitalist class. And nothing will so hearten Socialists in Germany as absolute confidence that in no circumstances whatever will Socialists in Britain ever desert Socialism, no matter what specious argument is advanced by Socialism's enemies and false friends.

The Socialist Party of Great Britain is able to assure the workers of all countries that there will be no compromise with capitalism as far as we are concerned. We are and will remain Socialists, independent of and hostile to capitalist parties of all kinds.

So far from helping capitalism to tide over its difficulties the working class should adopt and alter the slogan of the old Irish nationalists and avow that capitalism's extremity is Socialism's opportunity. H.

The Future of Palestine

THE rise of the Nazi Party to power in Germany, with the subsequent persecution of Jews, has resulted in renewed interest in the Zionist movement.

Zionism first came into existence as a political theory at the end of last century at the time of the Dreyfus case. Before then it had taken, more or less, the form of a religious longing to return to the "Holy" Land. It happened that an Austrian journalist, Dr. Theodore Herzl, had been sent to Paris to report on the Dreyfus affair, for a Vienna newspaper. Dr. Herzl was a Jew who had assimilated the culture and manners of Austrian society, and was greatly removed from Judaism. But the story goes that the Dreyfus case, with its attendant anti-Semitism, stirred him so deeply that he set himself the momentous task of discovering a solution to the Jewish problem. He "discovered" that the Jews are persecuted because they have no country of "their own," and that the problem would be solved if they could be confined to a certain geographical area. He expounded these views in his book, "The Jewish State," and declared that the Jews must establish a state of their own, preferably in Palestine. He

obtained the support of well-known men like Max Nordau, Israel Zangwill and the French Baron, Edmond de Rothschild, who contributed a large fortune for the cause.

In 1901 the Jewish National Fund was inaugurated, in order to facilitate the collection of money for the purchase of land in Palestine and to assist the settlement of Jews in that country.

The movement grew slowly, but in 1917 Lord Balfour addressed his famous letter to Lord Rothschild, informing him that "His Majesty's Government view with favour the establishment of a Jewish national home in Palestine..." This aroused the enthusiasm of Jews all over the world, who now imagined that here at last was something worth striving for. It was not, however, till 1921, when the Palestine mandate was finally granted to England by the Allied Powers, that the Zionist movement began to assume a more practical form. Different parties had arisen in Zionism representing a variety of opinions and interests. There were the General Zionists, the Poale Zionists ("Socialists") and the Mizrachists (religious party).

At about this time Dr. Chaim Weitzmann, the chemist who helped to supply England with ex-

plosives during the Great War, was the leader of the World Zionist movement, and he sought to interest prominent British Jews in the development of Palestine. Amongst those whom he visited was the late Lord Melchett, head of the Imperial Chemical Industries. We are told by his biographer, Hector Bolitho ("Alfred Mond, first Lord Melchett") that Dr. Weitzmann touched some hidden chord in Lord Melchett's heart, with the result that Melchett visited the "Holy Land." He was so impressed that, according to his biographer, "... he had made a vow that he would amass a fortune of fifteen millions, that he would work ruthlessly, until he had enough money to bring the Jews back to their country..." (page 366). He was elected to important positions in the Zionist movement, but we are told that "... the business man in him caused him to curb his zeal and work cautiously..." (page 369).

There now arose a great deal of dissatisfaction with the administration of the Zionist movement, and the Union of Zionist Revisionists was formed by Vladimir Jabotinsky, assisted by Meyer Grossmann, who claimed that their policy alone was in line with the original Herzlian ideal. Meyer Grossman, however, has since left the Revisionists and formed another party of his own called the "Jewish State Party."

In 1929 there was a serious Arab uprising, stated to have been caused by a demonstration at the Wailing Wall of Jerusalem. Lord Melchett, greatly incensed at the slaughter of his "fellow Jews" in Palestine, poured an avalanche of letters on the Press, and spoke passionately at a huge protest meeting in the Albert Hall. He wrote a letter to Lord Beaverbrook beseeching him to give the support of his Press to the Zionist movement. Hector Bolitho (page 370) quotes this letter to Beaverbrook: "... It ought to be under the India Office, which is used to dealing with Eastern people... We might as well say that we must evacuate India because of the Moslem rows there... as that we must evacuate Palestine because once in six years there is a week's trouble... We simply cannot evacuate Palestine, for the reason that if we did the Italians would be only too glad to walk in... and the French would support them. It would give them command of our flying route to India... and one bank of the Suez Canal... They would then command a magnificent naval harbour in Haifa, the outlet of what is probably the most important oilfield outside the United States of America—the Mosul oilfield."

Lord Beaverbrook, however, did not agree with Melchett. He looked on Palestine as a barren, rocky country with little avenue for profit-making. But Melchett did not see Palestine as barren and rocky. His biographer tells us (page 371) that Melchett "... had bought hundreds of acres of land; he had seen the Dead Sea concessions

and the Rutenberg Electric Power Concession growing from strength to strength..."

In view of this we are at a loss to understand whether Melchett wanted 15 million pounds to bring the Jews back to Palestine or whether he hoped to make this sum by bringing them to Palestine!

Revisionist Fury.

The Revisionists and the other sections were furious at this Arab uprising, the blame for which they laid at the door of the General Zionists because of their maladministration. A congress was called and Nahum Sokolow was elected president in succession to Weitzmann. But this did not stem the opposition of the Revisionists, who claimed that Sokolow or Weitzmann represented the same policy. Stormy scenes occurred. The Revisionists hurled unkind epithets like "Red gangsters" at the "Socialist" Zionists, who retorted by calling the Revisionists "Dirty Fascists." Mr. Jabotinsky tore up his congress card, and together with a large body of Revisionists marched out of the Congress Hall. (Quite recently the Revisionists left the Zionist Organisation completely.) When Lord Melchett died, his son continued to support the Zionist movement. He also holds an honoured place on the Board of Directors of Palestine Potash, Ltd.

Among other prominent Jewish capitalists who support Zionism are Lord Reading, Sir Robert Waley-Cohen, Sir Montague Burton and Sir Herbert Samuel. These capitalists feel themselves "touched" at the plight of their "fellow" Jews all over the world, and they have contributed large sums of money towards the Zionist movement. Hardly an appeal is made without some of these names, and others equally prominent appearing in the list of donors.

The quest of a country of one's own would lead some people to believe that the Jews are different from any other race or nation. But Jews, like other races, are divided into two classes, capitalists and workers, and the fact that a Jew is employed by another Jew does not alter his standing. He is a wage-slave and will be treated as such. No special privileges are conferred on him on account of his religious beliefs, or because of the shape and size of his nose. He is exploited with no less vigour than, for instance, is a Jewish worker employed by a non-Jew, or a non-Jew worker employed by a Jewish capitalist. All capitalists, be they black, white, Mohammedan, Christian, Buddhist, Jew or atheist, exist by exploitation, and it is the workers whom they exploit.

As has already been mentioned, the Zionists represent all types of opinions, and there is even a so-called Socialist Party amongst them. This party is out to build a "Socialist" country in Palestine for Jews only, but their "Socialism" is

only Labourism—"State ownership," and the usual stock-in-trade of reform parties. We need not pay much attention to this party and its chimeras. It spends its time in compromising with the General Zionists, and declaring coalitions. It speaks airily about "Marxism" and claims to have set up "Communist" colonies in Palestine.

Jewish Imperialists.

The party that most concerns us is the Union of Zionist Revisionists, who are the only party which demand a Jewish state in the fullest sense of the word. Palestine to them is not a place where a few thousand Polish and German Jews may find refuge, it is not a spiritual home where Jews may study the Talmud, or attend universities. Palestine must be a Jewish state, inhabited by a Jewish majority, governed by Jews, administered by Jewish civil servants, and "protected" by a Jewish navy, army, air force and police.

In their pamphlet "Blue-White Papers, 1935," they say "... we happen to be thoroughly convinced that a Jewish state on both sides of the Jordan is not only the best way, but the only way to give the Empire a permanent stronghold

on the Mediterranean... Many British statesmen fully realise that the whole value of Palestine to the Empire depends on its transformation into a Jewish state... Palestine as a Jewish state, surrounded on all sides by Arab countries, will in the interests of its own preservation always tend to lean upon some powerful Empire, non-Arab and non-Mohammedan. This is an almost providential basis for a permanent alliance between Britain and a Jewish Palestine..."

But why is it the British Government does not see eye to eye with the Revisionists? The reason is that they have many conflicting aspects to take into account. A movement by the British Government towards the establishment of a purely Jewish state in Palestine would, for example, arouse antagonism from the Arabs. It favours British imperial interests to remain on good terms with the Arabs as well as with the Jews. They are not going to burn their fingers for Mr. Jabotinsky and Co. Again, it is hard to see how a Jewish state in Palestine will make England's position more secure in the Mediterranean.

KAYE AND SCRUTATOR.

(To be continued.)

Notes by the Way

Isn't It Wonderful?

An advertisement in the *Manchester Guardian* of June 10th, appealing for funds for a holiday charity, runs as follows:—

What? 130 every week? Yes, isn't it wonderful? 3,380 poor girls and boys having a week by the sea. ... Ten shillings pays for one.

Yes, isn't it wonderful. One Manchester charity alone can find nearly 4,000 children whose parents cannot afford 10s. to send them to see the waves of which their race is (or was) supposed to be the ruler. Children of an imperial race, they are too poor to visit the coast of "this precious stone, set in the silver sea."

Wrong, Mr. Garvin.

What is "the question which transcends every other"? Mr. Garvin in the *Observer* (June 9th) says that it is the question of building aircraft. Mr. Garvin is wrong. The question of our age is how soon the working class will dispossess the capitalist class of the means of production and distribution and make them the common property of society as a whole.

The More it is Cured the Worse it Will be.

The slum problem has been "solved" so often that it must seem an impertinence even to speak of it again. The latest solution was that announced by the Labour-controlled London

County Council. Now the *Star* has had an interview with an L.C.C. housing expert, and this is what the expert says:—

The L.C.C. has 86 slum-clearing schemes in hand, but, despite the efforts of the Council and other authorities, London's slum problem is likely to be more acute 20 years hence than it is now. (*Star*, June 7th.)

The expert, Miss Mary Boyce, the Council's Inquiry Officer, explains that twenty years hence thousands of homes which are now in fairly good condition will be slums.

A Question to the President of the Indian Trade Union Congress.

In every country in the world there are patriotic or nationalist movements which take their stand on the claim that national independence is an issue of paramount importance, but being somewhat inconsistent they are rarely content to make their appeal in the name of nationalism alone. Always they add on to it the argument that independence is desirable also on economic grounds. The reason for this is easy to see. The great mass of the population everywhere is distracted with economic worries and any party or leader seeking power has to frame an appeal accordingly. So we find Hitler telling his working class admirers that Germany will be prosperous only when she has reconquered territory where the population is wholly or partly German, and colonial territory formerly

belonging to Germany—although as regards the latter there is no pretence of a German population.

The same argument was put in definite form by Pandit Hari Shastri, president of the All-India Trade Union Congress, in an address at Calcutta on April 20th. According to the *Indian Labour Journal* (April 28th, 1935), he said:—

The working class... must form combinations, and find out allies that have one common mission of throwing Imperialist yoke from this country and bringing about National Independence—an independence that would usher in an era of prosperity for the masses.

Now let us put a question to Mr. Shastri: "Being a learned man it is to be assumed that you know the utter absence of prosperity that is the condition of the masses in all the countries of the world, whether large or small, independent or not. Knowing this, will you tell us and the Indian masses exactly why you believe that independence, which has not brought prosperity to the masses in other independent countries, will do so in India?"

—And the Answer

By one of those happy coincidences the same issue of the *Indian Labour Journal* contains an answer to Mr. Shastri. It is a statement about the condition of the Indian masses in the Indian States—i.e., territories where the rule is that of Indian Princes, not the rule of a foreign ruling class. Are the masses there in an era of prosperity? Mr. Shastri knows full well that they are not. Mr. Shastri also knows that Indian rulers, Indian landlords and Indian capitalists will be not an iota less harsh than foreigners in their exploitation of the Indian workers. He knows that the statement quoted below from the *Journal* is correct:—

At present, in most of the States, no Trade Unions are allowed to exist, and whenever there is the slightest sign of revolt against the oppressive conditions of work on the part of the workers, the police at once appear on the scene and quell all insubordination with their usual vigour.

Mr. Shastri and all who preach nationalism to the working class are on the side of the exploiters, fighting against the onward march of Socialism.

Building up the Home Market

One of the illusions of those who believe they can administer capitalism in a non-capitalist way is that they will "develop the home market" and thus free themselves from dependence on foreign trade and from the consequent risk of war. Among those who have preached this doctrine have been the I.L.P. and Labour Party, the Communists and the various groups of Fascists. In practice we see them all rushing into the scramble for world trade. For this purpose the Russians concentrate on such products as gold and oil; Hitler pays

subsidies to enable German exporters to capture foreign markets (*Daily Telegraph*, March 16th), and Mussolini preaches that Italy's destiny is in Africa (*Daily Express*, March 20th, 1934). Capitalism does not change its nature because its apologists rig themselves out in differently coloured shirts.

At one time Sir O. Mosley was a believer in the "home market," but recently in a speech at the Albert Hall (see report in *Manchester Guardian*, March 25th, 1935), he said:—

Unless Germany can expand in the East and Japan in China, what hope is there of peace? There is only one solution—if the four Great Powers of Europe went Fascist.

Lest we Forget

All of the wings of the so-called Labour movement, from Henderson to Maxton and from Stafford Cripps to Pollitt, unite in denouncing the infamy and treachery of Ramsay MacDonald and Lord Snowden. Let it not be forgotten, then, that the power these men had to mislead and betray the workers was given to them by those who smothered them with fulsome praise, placed them in positions of eminence, defended them against Socialist criticism, and voted them into Parliament and thus into political office. Messrs. Maxton, Cripps and Pollitt all share the blame. When Maxton and the I.L.P. try to evade responsibility they have to explain away what they said in the past.

Mr. Maxton in 1930 (*Manchester Guardian*, August 16th, 1930) admitted that it was the I.L.P. which "made the 1924 Labour Government possible and made Mr. MacDonald and Mr. Snowden the national figures that they are."

Anyone who spends his time popularising men instead of preaching Socialist principles is paving the way for a future collapse like that of 1931.

H.

THE SOCIALIST STANDARD

Fill in and post to Literature Secretary, 42, Great Dover Street, London, S.E.1, and get this paper regularly.

Please send me THE SOCIALIST STANDARD regularly for 12 months, for which I enclose 2s. 6d. (for six months, 1s. 3d.)

Name

Address

Notes of the Month

Where has Leadership Led?

Mr. MacDonald's career can offer a striking parallel to those of several rulers of to-day. Hitler, Mussolini, the late Pilsudski, all rose from obscurity to positions of power, all claimed to be "Socialists," though some have now abandoned their so-called "Socialism." All of which is held by critics to "prove" that "Socialists" abuse power just like capitalists, etc., etc. In fact, the S.P.G.B.'s case is borne out by the illustrations given. Socialism really means giving power to no one individual or even group of individuals. As we understand and propagate Socialism, its establishment must be the intelligent task of the majority of the people, a complete denial to the leadership personified by the MacDonalds, etc., and glorified by people and parties posing as Socialist.

Incidentally, it is no coincidence that all these aforementioned "leaders" used the word "Socialism" as part of the magic sesame to power. "Socialism" is popular to-day, it represents the instinctive aspirations of the working class for a better world. When Socialism is *understood* by the workers, the aspirations of demagogues and political cheap-jacks will get a rude jolt.

Capitalist Reward "Socialists"!

Among the recipients of Birthday honours are three Labour stalwarts: Mr. Walter Citrine, Mr. Pugh, both leading figures in the trade union movement, and Mr. T. Edwards, Chief Whip of the Labour Party in the House of Commons, receive knighthoods. Messrs. Citrine and Pugh get substantial salaries for guarding the workers' interests on the economic field. Knighthoods are given by the Government for "services rendered" to the "public." As this same "public" is split into two warring factions by conflicting economic interests, namely workers and employers, it would be interesting to know how these representatives of the workers have managed to serve two loyalties at once. Or have they? 'Nuff said!

"Public Ownership" is not Socialism!

An announcement by the London Labour Party, commenting on the Transport Board's proposed development of tubes is quoted by the *Daily Herald* (June 7th, 1935): It says: "'This announcement of the Government,' stated the London Labour Party yesterday, 'fully proves the advantages of public ownership and the elimination of competition, and is a vindication of the constructive Socialist principles for which the Labour Party stands.'" Mr. H. Morrison, quoted in the same page of the *Herald*, stated: "Had the old order of things, with its large number of separate and

conflicting ownerships, continued, these improvements could certainly not have been made without heavy State subsidy . . . Under the new order of things, however . . . it is practically certain the State will get through without contributing a penny."

We are almost weary of pointing out that placing any section of industry or the whole of it for that matter under State control or ownership, has nothing to do with Socialism and will not solve the workers' problems. On Mr. Morrison's own statement, however, it *will* benefit the capitalist class as a whole as represented by the State. The announcement by the London Labour Party proves conclusively, if further proof were needed, that the Labour Party's object is not Socialism, but some form of State capitalism. The working class would still be wage-slaves, property-less, and exploited by the owning class through the State direct.

In the well-known phrase, we would ask workers who support the Labour Party: "Is that worth fighting for?"

United Front in France

The financial crisis in France, owing to which several Governments fell, produced a piquant situation amongst the "left wing" parties. The French "Socialist" Party (equivalent to the Labour Party here) has formed a "United Front" with the Communist Party. Before M. Laval succeeded in forming a Government, the Press reported that attempts were being made by the Radicals (Liberals), Socialists and Communists to form a "Provisional" Government. That Communists and Socialists can even entertain the idea of forming a Government in coalition with Liberals for the purpose of administering capitalism should be sufficient to disillusion believers in the "Communist" brand of Communism. And what a "United Front"!

Collective Security in a Competitive World!

The League of Nations ballot, in which over ten million votes were cast, is hailed as a great triumph for peace and the League. Does that mean that ten million people would refuse to sanction a war should the British Government think it necessary to go to war? Certainly not! And can the League of Nations prevent wars? The fact that it is composed of the representatives of capitalist Governments, each of whom is there to keep an eye on the other, to bargain and intrigue with another, seems to have escaped the notice of our League enthusiasts. Every Government to-day is busy piling up armaments, Japan is busy

"annexing" huge slices of China, a war between Bolivia and Paraguay had been in progress for three years and Italy is sending thousands of soldiers to the Abyssinian frontier. If the League was unable or unwilling to act as an instrument of peace in those instances, can we expect better results in the event of several big powers clashing? Does anyone seriously believe that the delegates of the various capitalist Governments, who were involved in vital disputes, could in some miraculous way prevent war? Recently a big "triumph" was claimed for the League for its "settlement" of the Italian-Abyssinian dispute. The Labour Party were, in fact, grovelling at the feet of Mr. Eden, the "Peacemaker." Now comes Mussolini's pronouncement attacking Britain. "We will imitate to the letter those who presume to be our schoolmasters," he said. "They have shown that when it was necessary to create or defend an Empire they did not take into consideration at all the opinions of the world" (*Daily Herald*, June 10th, 1935). Mussolini's defiance may be bluff, but he is certainly exposing the hypocrisy of Britain, the "honest broker." The cause of wars is capitalism with its rivalry for markets, its lust for territory and natural resources, its craving for more and more workers to exploit. Not all the statesmen in the world, however ardent they may desire peace, can prevent these factors creating situations which need only the proverbial spark to set the world ablaze. Socialism is the only solution.

Co-ops. in Congress.

The Co-operative Congress at Cardiff revealed once more how little this tremendous business organisation has in common with Socialism. Much of the discussion centred around the Co-ops' attitude towards the Labour Party. Being a business concern, their interests demanded representation which the Labour Party could not fully satisfy. So much so that their president, Mr. Wyndham I. Edwards, declared: "We have the largest single political party in the country. We are prepared to march shoulder to shoulder with our friends of the Labour Party, but we are not prepared to lose our identity." (*Daily Herald*, June 14th, 1935.) Their "largest single political party" exists only on the books of the Co-op., but we are content to let these "comrades of the united front of Labour" do their own haggling.

More important from our own point of view is the attack made on the Co-op. by Mr. J. Jagger, president of the National Union of Distributive and Allied Workers, who alleged that:

in the Co-op. movement there was the same readiness to attack wages as was to be found among the great captains of industry (*Daily Herald*, June 11th).

Mr. Lawther, of the Co-op., who quoted the above statement, took the usual stand which em-

ployers take with their workers, namely that of attempting to discredit them. There was this difference, however. Mr. Lawther used the plea of the "identity of interest between the trade unions and the Co-ops. as two wings of the great Labour movement." (*Daily Herald*, June 11th, 1935.)

We hope that Co-op. employees will not be taken in by this sort of talk, which is merely meant to hide the fact that Co-op. Societies are employers like any other trading concern, and will make use of similar methods to enforce wage-cuts, etc.

S. RUBIN.

Answers to Correspondents

W.P.B.—Please forward name and address.

ED. COMM.

LECTURE SYLLABUSES.

The Syllabuses of Lectures given at Head Office classes during last winter are available on application to S. Stewart, at 42, Great Dover Street, S.E.1. Price, 2s. a set, post free (with folder, 2s. 3d.).

AN OPEN-AIR SOCIAL.

An Open-air Social will take place on Saturday, July 13th, at No. 5, Upper Walthamstow Road, two minutes from Wood Street Station.

There will be dancing and games. The Social commences at 7.30 p.m. In the event of rain all activities will take place under cover. Admission free. SOCIAL COMMITTEE.

MANCHESTER

Sunday Outdoor Meetings

Meetings are being held throughout July and August each Sunday as follows:—

Platt Fields	-	-	-	3 p.m.
Alexandra Park Gates	-	-	-	7.30 p.m.
Stevenson Square	-	-	-	7 p.m.

BLOOMSBURY

Lectures will be given on Monday evenings at A.E.U. Hall, 39, Doughty Street (Corner of Guildford Street), W.C.1. at 8.30 p.m.

July 1st	-	-	-	"The Menace of the Machine" E. HARDY.
" 8th	-	-	-	"The Transport Octopus" G. BELLINGHAM
" 15th	-	-	-	"The Socialism of G. B. Shaw" DEVEREUX
" 22nd	-	-	-	"Will a Labour Government Hasten Socialism" S. STEWART
" 29th	-	-	-	"Riots or Revolution" ISBITSKY

Admission free. All invited. Questions and Discussion.

THE SOCIALIST STANDARD

JULY,



1935

OFFICIAL NOTICE

All communications for the Executive Committee. Subscriptions for the SOCIALIST STANDARD, Articles, and Correspondence submitted for insertion therein, should be addressed—The Socialist Party of Great Britain, 42, Great Dover Street, London, S.E.1, to whom Money Orders should be made payable.

The meetings of the Executive Committee are held at the Head Office, every Tuesday, at 7.30 p.m.

TERMS OF SUBSCRIPTIONS.

Twelve Months, post free	2s. 6d.
Six Months, post free	1s. 3d.

Let Us Now Praise Famous Men

It is an unwritten law of the newspaper world that the rich and the politically powerful must always be represented in a favourable light. Their vices must be veiled if at all possible, and if they are so glaring that they simply force themselves on the notice of the general public, then they must be given a certain twist. They must be made to appear as the pardonable eccentricities of genius, or lightly turned aside with the sycophantic snigger which our Press and literary gentlemen reserve exclusively for their capitalist masters. Thus it happens that Mr. X—, where friends know him to be a drunken gambler, appears to the readers of the newspaper as a jovial soul, with heart of gold—all because he is a powerful instrument for deluding working class electorates in the interest of capitalism. This courtesy is also extended to foreign potentates, and only temporarily abandoned for purposes of war. Newspaper readers soon forget, and are not at all shaken in their trustfulness when they see Lord Rothermere, for example, heaping praises on the head of that "great man," the ex-Crown Prince of Germany, only a few years after Lord Rothermere's newspapers had represented him as the world's prize buffoon.

Then there is the Polish Marshal, Jozef Pilsudski, who died recently. This loud-mouthed renegade from the Labour movement (his speeches were sometimes so filled with violent obscenity that

journalists dared not report them), was given thousands of words of extravagant praise in the English Press. The *Times* gave him nearly four columns, and discussed with its usual show of impartiality his greatness as soldier and statesman, and the "daring and romantic" qualities of his character. Some sentiment had to be brought in, so we are told that "his chief happiness was found in the company of soldiers and children." He gave many children's parties, and in his later years they were almost his only recreation—it is curious how often the world's principal pests are fond of children—but the *Times* does not trouble to estimate how many soldiers were slaughtered and children orphaned to further the limitless lust for power of this megalomaniac. Among his early activities was naked banditry, raiding mail trains and similar activities, calculated to harass the Russian Government at a time when Pilsudski was a Russian citizen. It may be remarked here that if the banditry and the insurrectionary movements had failed instead of succeeding, Pilsudski's death would not have received four columns. It would then probably have contented the *Times* to publish a three-line paragraph, notifying the death of the notorious Polish bandit and assassin.

Great Man—Great Liar.

An interesting pendant to the career of this "great statesman" was provided in a letter which the *Times* published on May 23rd. It was a report of a statement Pilsudski made to a fellow prisoner on his release from exile in Siberia:—

During these years that we suffered together I learned to love and respect you, and I now know that the whole of Russia does not consist of gendarmes, police spies, and other torturers of my people. But when I come home I will not tell the Poles of this my new experience; let them think that all Russia is one undivided hostile and beastly camp, lest their will for fighting for freedom should become blunted!

So the great statesman was a great liar, prepared to indict a nation in order that his dupes, the Polish workers and peasants, might be kept at the appropriate fever-heat for the slaughter of Russian workers and peasants, who, for their part, were similarly duped. Give heed to this, you workers who may some day again be called upon to "fight for freedom." Remember that the political tricksters who rule all the nations of the world, all make us of the same vile methods of deceiving you. When they tell you that the "enemy" country is "one undivided hostile and beastly camp," and appeal to you not to allow your "will for fighting for freedom" to be blunted, remember Jozef Pilsudski's indiscreet confession, and know them for the liars they are. Know that they will be asking you, the working class, to fight each other in order that they, the capitalist class, may continue to enjoy the privileges of an exploiting class.

Materialism as a Taboo

A GLASGOW reader of the SOCIALIST STANDARD has asked us to explain the reasons for the wide publicity given by the Press to such anti-materialist pronouncements as are sometimes made by men of science.

He asks why the "reactionaries" hate materialism and expresses the opinion that "apparently" the class struggle manifests itself in other than economic spheres. To adequately answer these points would necessitate our taking up far more space than we can afford in one issue of this Journal. Therefore, only a brief summary can now be attempted. Quite a lengthy article could be written on the unscientific views of scientists on materialism, but we prefer to let that pass just now. Broadly speaking, materialism is taboo in bourgeois intellectual and traditional thought, because it cuts at the roots of religion.

Since its insistence on explaining and knowing the world of animate and inanimate nature by Nature's own processes, materialism inevitably and fundamentally conflicts with the religious and semi-scientific viewpoints, which cannot dispense with supernatural "seemings," anyhow.

Regarding the Press it should be clear that generally the owners, editors and writers of newspapers are lamentably ignorant of the real meaning of materialism, even though, and in some senses because, they have experienced some University training in science and philosophy. A quasi-religious bias permeates and even vitiates their entire outlook in every field of thought. The statement of Marx,

that: "The tradition of all past generations weighs like an alp upon the brain of the living," is

as true here as in any other aspect of social life. It would appear that science or no science accommodation must be had somewhere in thought for the notion that some "creative force" exists outside and above nature to initiate and control the movements of the universe. All the prepossessions derived from an early religious training linger on, despite whatever transformations in general ideology are effected by scientific advance.

Added to this is the all-important fact that the bourgeoisie have no fundamental need to destroy the religious concepts.

Hence the bias weighted against materialism because of its exclusion and negation of the supernatural hypothesis. Still are there other and more immediate reasons for anti-materialist propaganda. The great bulk of newspaper readers are unquestionably under the influence of the God idea, and these must be catered for and pandered to at all costs. There is money in the "business," and surely are the profits of the Press as sacrosanct as all profit in capitalist production. Sales have to be maintained and, consequently, the mental attitude of newspaper readers is of paramount importance. It is not only a force to be reckoned with, but

THE SOCIALIST PARTY OF GREAT BRITAIN

OBJECT.—The establishment of a system of society based upon the common ownership and democratic control of the means and instruments for producing and distributing wealth by and in the interest of the whole community.

DECLARATION OF PRINCIPLES THE SOCIALIST PARTY of Great Britain HOLDS—

1. That society as at present constituted is based upon the ownership of the means of living (i.e., land, factories, railways, etc.) by the capitalist or master class, and the consequent enslavement of the working class, by whose labour alone wealth is produced.

2. That in society, therefore, there is an antagonism of interests, manifesting itself as a class struggle, between those who possess but do not produce, and those who produce but do not possess.

3. That this antagonism can be abolished only by the emancipation of the working class from the domination of the master class, by the conversion into the common property of society of the means of production and distribution, and their democratic control by the whole people.

4. That as in the order of social evolution the working class is the last class to achieve its freedom, the emancipation of the working class will involve the emancipation of all mankind without distinction of race or sex.

5. That this emancipation must be the work of the working class itself.

6. That as the machinery of government, including the armed forces of the nation, exists only to conserve the monopoly by the capitalist class of the wealth taken from the workers, the working class must organise consciously and politically for the conquest of the powers of government, national and local, in order that this machinery, including these forces, may be converted from an instrument of oppression into the agent of emancipation and the overthrow of privilege, aristocratic and plutocratic.

7. That as all political parties are but the expression of class interests, and as the interest of the working class is diametrically opposed to the interests of all sections of the master class, the party seeking working-class emancipation must be hostile to every other party.

8. THE SOCIALIST PARTY of Great Britain, therefore, enters the field of political action determined to wage war against all other political parties, whether alleged labour or avowedly capitalist, and calls upon the members of the working class of this country to muster under its banner to the end that a speedy termination may be wrought to the system which deprives them of the fruits of their labour, and that poverty may give place to comfort, privilege to equality, and slavery to freedom.

Those agreeing with the above principles and desiring enrolment in the Party should apply for membership form to secretary of nearest branch or at Head Office.

One to be encouraged.

It should not be difficult to see, therefore, why the crude facilities of religion are both consciously and subconsciously perpetuated by the pressmen. It is

still true that those who have the "public ear" hold the public "by the ears" in the simple yet skilful process of fanning the flame of popular ignorance and prejudice. There must be no mistake that religion still offers a tolerably safe refuge to the social quacks and confusionists of all shades.

The ruling class in general still look to religion as a sort of stalking-horse to override the effects of working-class exploitation.

The emotional appeals of "brotherly love" and "kindliness" which are falsely but inextricably mixed up with religion, serve to blur the edge of the class conflict, and to this extent is a barrier erected against the working class recognising the true cause of its subjugation. Again, the Church and practically every denomination in religion, has large property and investment holdings throughout the world and, therefore, quite readily sanctions the private property institution to be a "blessed" one.

Our correspondent is certainly correct in his suggestion that the class struggle manifests itself in other than the economic field and, as a matter of sociological fact, it cannot be otherwise. The diametrically opposed interests of capitalists and workers must of necessity find its reflex in rival schools of thought.

The clash of interests in the purely economic sphere anywhere and any when will inevitably find its expression in a line of thought in keeping with the interest to be conserved.

The economic interest of the workers, and in the larger sense their social interest, finds its final expression in Socialism—in the overthrow of private property, in the means of life and the reorganisation of human society upon the basis of common ownership of the whole world's economic resources. This is why Socialism, rightly interpreted, with its insistence upon the materialist standpoint in history and philosophy is heretical in bourgeois and such semi-bourgeois circles as exist, even in the Labour movement.

However, we think it opportune to advise the holding in mind of certain reservations when considering such "hatred" displayed against any given unorthodox theory. For it is safe to say that the ruling class will tolerate any philosophy or scientific theory, especially where there exists the chance of manipulating such to their own requirements. "Borrowed plumes" are not quite unfashionable in the ideal process of meeting economic ends. As a variation of this, note how bourgeois sentiments seem at present to be favourably disposed towards Russia since that country's emergence from the mouthing of "Marxian" phrases to its present niche within the "comity" of capitalist nations. Few seem now disposed to wish to suck the blood from Bolshevik bodies as they were a few years ago, especially now that the Russian Communists sing "God Save the King" at diplomatic functions.

Compromise is an essential condition of all bourgeois economic and intellectual development, and is, in fact, within keeping of the great traditions of history. As such the milestones along the road of social evolution are marked to guide those who will but see—and learn. It is in some measure the biological urge of animal adaptation to environment expressed on the sociological field—a process of partially assimilating otherwise fundamentally conflicting views and interests to meet the exigencies of ruling-class needs. It is here that the student of Socialist thought has a special need of "checking up" on the terms he uses to connote his ideas. Bank notes and cheques are not the only means of fraudulent conversion; the same things occurs in the domain of thought where a material purpose is to be served. The process is as follows: A theory is propounded, is first ignored, then misrepresented and abused, then finally merged by distortion to keep the prevailing interest intact. Thus, among many things, the principle of organic evolution, so hotly assailed at the time of Darwin's publication of the "Origin of Species," as a falsifier of Biblical doctrines is now interpreted to suit the apologists for religion. "God" is part of the entire evolutionary process. He (or is it a she, or what not) is supposed to be working through what is called "creative evolution," and God even appears to have evolved himself. Who knows that we may hear of "God" being hailed as a "spiritual materialist." In this the process of adaptation is well-nigh completely transparent to all. From another side, where, oh! where, do we find to-day a writer of note on history or society who does not make some use of Marx's materialist conception of history? We find these everywhere, and no matter from what angle of view they may write. But there is generally a distortion somewhere to be found in such writings.

Some of the arguments run as follows: Marx and Engels were largely correct in ascribing economic forces to be the main factors in social change, or in any of society's major movements, but on the issue of the class struggle, well, that can hardly be said to have scientific foundation. So run some of the arguments. A really consistent world philosophy or scientific outlook can hardly ever be the property of bourgeois thought.

The intricacies and ramifications of all capitalist interest in an ever-changing economic world merely make, mar and distort the possibility of a really scientific and fully comprehensive education. Aside from this, and as hinted at above, fundamentally the ruling class have no direct needs to be expressed in scientific or philosophical systems. It is generally sufficient for their whole mode of life that ways and means be found to help retain or increase their hold over the means of life. But with the working class, however, the position is different. This class, because of its subjection and consequent exploita-

tion, has a dire need of cultivating a view of life not merely different from that of the bourgeoisie, but one that uproots and transforms every "social ideal" dear to the heart of the latter. The abolition of class domination, with its arrogance, pomp and panoply, and the formation of a classless society, must be the foundation-stone of rising working-class culture. And the striving for this must scientifically compel the workers to keep their attention upon factual interpretations of the world

as it has been in the past, as it is at present, and as they may be able to shape it in the future. The materialist basis of Socialism, which compels us to realise that class-parasitism must first be removed in the interest of working-class emancipation, must inevitably arouse hatred in the ruling-class mind. For our part, the "hatred" may continue, anyhow. Our supreme task is to educate and organise the working class for Socialism.

ROBERTUS.

Strike Riots in Rhodesia

TROOPS USED TO INTIMIDATE WORKERS

FROM the reports which appeared in the Press on the recent strike riots in Rhodesia it is now possible to form a fairly clear picture of what occurred.

The immediate cause of the trouble was the putting into operation of the Native Tax Amendment Ordinance, 1935. This Ordinance professed to alter the basis of taxation, in this case the poll tax, from the place of domicile, otherwise the home town, to the place of residence, otherwise the place where the worker was employed. At the same time it increased the basis of taxation.

It may be mentioned in parenthesis that the workers involved are native workers, and according to one report (*Times*, May 29th) the new taxation caused a differentiation between rural and urban natives, to the advantage of the rural natives. Here would seem to be an indication of a well-known ruse of the capitalist class of setting one section of workers against another section.

It is difficult to state with certainty the amounts of the actual taxation and increases, but the various reports would seem to indicate a very high taxation compared with a very low standard of living.

According to the *Manchester Guardian* of May 30th the poll tax was increased from 10s. to 15s. per head, and according to the *Morning Post* of June 1st the total tax then amounted in many cases to almost one month's pay.

The indignation of these native workers, therefore, becomes readily understandable. Many of the white officials on the spot realised that the workers had ground for complaint, and sympathised with their position. Even the Johannesburg correspondent of the *Morning Post* states that it was "unfair to impose new taxation on the natives, amounting in many cases to almost one month's pay, without explaining the situation to them."

As a result 600 natives struck work in the Luanshya copper mine, demanding increased pay to meet the new taxation. However, the Rhodesian workers, not having been well drilled

in the methods of capitalist civilisation, not only went on strike, but did a little rioting as well, and 3,000 of them wrecked the mine compound and offices of the London registered concern known as Roan Antelope Copper Mines, Ltd., authorised capital £1,750,000, issued £1,557,000. This company owns 10,802 acres of mineral rights in the Luangwa copper mining belt. The means by which this ownership was acquired would be an interesting story in itself, and could be traced back to the days when the workers of England were expropriated from the land in order that they might be forced into the factories and mines in this country, thus commencing that period of production of surplus value which ends in a ruling class being able to buy blocks of shares in a copper syndicate for the purpose of exploiting workers abroad.

Fourteen Workers Killed

The capitalist class, however, were not slow to meet the situation. Police, equipped with Lewis guns, were very quickly on the spot. Eight hundred troops (presumably native troops) under European officers, were despatched with all speed to the area. Four R.A.F. troop carriers with two platoons of the Northern Rhodesian Regiment on board, and a big Heracles plane, carrying tear gas bombs were also hurried to the scene. Five hundred troops were paraded and marched round Luangwa.

In the attack on the compound six natives were killed, and it would appear that more were killed in the attack on the power station. At any rate, according to the *Morning Post* of June 4th, the total death roll had by then reached fourteen. Another fourteen workers sacrificed to the blood-thirsty greed of the capitalist class.

The display and use of force were sufficient and the workers have now quietened down. A Government Committee has been set up to investigate the disturbances, and it is to be hoped that, when published, it will throw further light on the native conditions.

Meanwhile, as showing how capitalist civilisation is developing in the furthest corners of the

earth, a few details may be noted. Luanshya itself, the chief centre of the trouble, is situated almost in the heart of Africa, in the north of Northern Rhodesia, and a few miles from the Belgian Congo. N'Kana, a copper mining town, still further north, was also affected. This town contains 2,000 Europeans, a most luxurious hotel, a cinema, and a magnificent mine club and various sports grounds; everything is modern, and the natives wear European dress. Broken Hill, an older town further south, where zinc and vanadium are produced, has four churches, and a good-sized cinema.

The story related above is another illustration of the Socialist contention that the main function of the armed forces is to keep the workers in subjection when they get restive, and thus to enable

the capitalists to retain as great a portion as possible of the wealth produced by the workers. When the occasion arises, the lethal weapons of modern warfare are used without compunction.

There have been many other cases in the last few years, in addition to the one described above. Readers will recollect that only a few months ago troops were used in mining strikes in the United States and in the North of France, whilst in Cuba the army and navy were used to suppress a general strike there.

The lesson for workers is plain. As the armed forces are controlled by Parliament the only way in which the workers can free themselves from the possibility of those forces being used against them is by getting a majority of Socialist delegates into this central strategic point. LAMO.

Lady Snowden Finds Us a Mission

On the question of peace, it was her conviction that the Anglo-Saxon people (Great Britain and the United States) had been intended by God to lead the world to permanent peace, as they had led towards the abolition of slavery. (Lady Snowden at Penmaenmawr, N. Wales, 24/4/35. Reported "Manchester Guardian," 25/4/35, page 16.)

TO Lady Snowden many thanks are due for thus bringing the great mission and duty of our race to the notice of those of us who were not aware of it. Whether Lady Snowden includes those people of the U.S.A. who are not of Anglo-Saxon extraction, one does not know, but the magnitude of the task certainly warrants our including them in the evangelical army.

If, as Lady Snowden is convinced, God has allotted to us the great healing mission of abolishing war and slavery, then either we have misunderstood instructions, or it is one of those wonders that God chooses to perform in mysterious ways. For if we examine the record of this country in foreign fields since the beginning of last century we could certainly conclude that our intentions have been far from peaceful. And a glance at a map of the world, splashed widely with red, would confirm that conclusion. But if peacefulness and acquisitiveness mean the same thing, then we have been a most peaceful nation.

Excluding altogether the Great War, it would be a difficult task to find the exact number of wars in which British armies have been engaged; but they are numerous. In Europe, apart from the Napoleonic Wars, the Crimean campaign in South Russia, Asia, numerous wars in India, three at least at Burma, interventions in China, Persia and Afghanistan, Africa; campaigns in Egypt and the Sudan, in East and West Africa; two wars against the Boers, and the earlier smaller affairs with the Zulus, and other native peoples. A goodly tally. On many occasions the peoples of Asia and Africa must have thanked God that we were

a peaceful race. We certainly have tried to ensure peace, by knocking all the fight out of the other fellows. Generally little fellows, be it noted.

Our cousins in America seem to have entered into the tranquillity business with less zest than ourselves. Apart from the small war with Spain, and one or two dusts in Cuba and Nicaragua, there is not much to record on the credit side of the ledger, except, of course, their long Civil War. They may have, of course, sufficiently exercised the blood-lust by wiping out the "Redskins" and knocking about a few Mexicans, and discontented nationals.

And can we be prouder of our attempts to abolish slavery than of our efforts to establish peace? It is true that in the early part of last century "Soapy Sam" Wilberforce campaigned against slavery under our Flag, and had some measure of support and success. But he had eyes only for certain things abroad. Conditions here in England were beneath his notice. While he was campaigning against chattel slavery in the foreign possessions, a system of slavery, wage-slavery, was being more intensely developed here. And a system hardly less pernicious than that which caused him so much concern. A system of "free" labour that forced men, women and children into mines and factories to work under most appalling conditions. Men, women and children, working 12, 14 and 16 hours a day, so that the industrialists, their masters, could take advantage of and keep pace with the markets that were being opened up by our "peace" armies. Wilberforce wrung the withers of his fellows with harrowing tales of the natives' sufferings. But no tears were shed for the women who worked themselves into early graves in the mines and mills of this country, as their men-folk could not earn enough. Wilberforce never noticed the barges carrying cargoes of children into Lanca-

shire and Yorkshire to provide cheap labour for the textile mills. Slavery? Children from the age of seven upwards working fourteen hours a day or more; sometimes twenty-four hours or more at a stretch, so that orders should be out to time. Slavery? These same children being belted by the overlookers to keep them awake. Slavery? Women working half naked in mines, filling and pushing tubs. Slavery? Women working in stinking, fetid atmospheres up to a week before they gave birth to children, because they couldn't forego the wages. Oh, yes, slavery was abolished by the righteous rulers of this country; abolished by rubbing out its name.

In America, it is true, civil war was waged between North and South to decide whether negro slavery should be abolished or not. The slaves were freed for what? To compete in the open labour market for just enough to keep body and soul together. Sometimes not so much. And America, having abolished chattel slavery, still received, by the hundred thousand, the poverty-stricken peasants of Europe. In "The Land of the Free" these pitiful and simple emigrants only exchanged the poverty of peasantry for the poverty of wage-slavery.

It can be agreed that gradually much of the

harshness and many of the grosser crudities of early industrialism have been removed. Expediency, however, has been as much the motive as kindness of heart. But granting all the claims of the humanitarians that conditions have grown better, there remains something which is perhaps far worse than long hours or low wages: the growing fearfulness of insecurity. The cry for better conditions has given place to the cry for jobs.

The abolition of slavery still remains to be done, and the abolition of war also; for slavery still persists, as does war or conditions of war. They will persist so long as the working class are content to remain slaves and, as slaves, are content to fight wars for their masters.

But there is a struggle which the workers must come to recognise.

This is the Class struggle, which arises from the workers' condition of wage slavery. That is not the struggle which Lady Snowden had in mind. She and her kind deny its existence when they can, or try to explain it away.

The Socialist explains that when the Class struggle has been fought to a successful finish slavery will be automatically abolished. Then will exist Classless Society; no more Wars, no more Slavery. L. W.

Straws

In Oil.

THE Rt. Hon. G. N. Barnes was presented with his portrait in oils at Geneva, in recognition of his 40 years "international work." In a sterner age recognition of his national "services" alone would have found expression by a disillusioned working class through the medium of boiling oil—minus the portrait.

Pensions—for ex-Soldiers.

"They will not get it while I am in office" (G. N. Barnes, 1916). The "they" included a big array of hopeless physical wrecks who had been "passed" for army service, the "it" being a pension. Ten years previously, as Chairman of the Labour Party, Barnes was warmly defending the "loyalty" of "Labour" to the Throne, and gaily voting additional grants to the Duchies of Lancaster and Cornwall. In 1909 he gave his blessing to a Wages Board Bill, whose chief merit (according to Keir Hardie) was "to cheapen the cost of production."

Paying Industries.

An Italian newspaper says that Sir Norman Angell "has made of peace a paying industry." Rather neatly put.

The Salvation Army has made a "paying

industry" of the down-an-out. Competition in the "Peace" line is now on the cards. General Evangeline Booth declares, "Never again can there be a real war in this God-hungry world," "which is coming it strong," whatever may be the import of "real" and "God-hungry," one thing is certain. The gold-hungry, oil-hungry, rubber-hungry capitalist may at any time succeed in making a pretty good imitation of the "real" thing, unless the working class remove the cause of war by abolishing its incentive—private property in the means of life.

Salvation—of Private Property.

In a foreword to the Salvation Army Social Report, 1909, it was asserted that the Army was building "a strong barrier against Socialism." It was probably for that reason that the High Priest of the Independent Labour Party of those days (James Ramsay MacDonald) said: "Whatever agency comes or goes, the country cannot spare one agency, and that is the Salvation Army."

The Salvation Army is being badly treated by the capitalist class. The work of their leaders is poorly paid in comparison with the fat incomes of "eminent" bishops. For exploitation of working class ignorance this blatant organisation easily beats the whole bench of bishops. REGINALD.

Books Reviewed

"Who's Who in Anthracite," by W. Fox.

"Seven Years of Railway Finance," by W. Fox.

Published by L. R. D., 60, Doughty Street, W.C.1.

IF you are interested in the pros and cons. of the anthracite industry, its history, how far it is centralised, who owns the shareholdings in it, and the extent of its financial obligations to the banks, its profits and losses over the past few years, the extent of its market in England and overseas, "Who's Who in Anthracite," by W. Fox, provides some very useful information.

The second pamphlet, "Seven Years of Railway Finance," by the same author, deals with the railway industry on similar lines. An attempt is made to show who owns the shares in the railway companies. Figures are quoted showing the rise and fall of railway receipts and profits in relation to the rise and fall in wages over a number of years. The extent of the railways' shareholdings in road transport is interesting. Mr. Fox says: "... by the end of 1931 over 8½ millions had been poured out by the railways in the acquisition of shares giving full or part control in the existing omnibus concerns, and one 'bus in every three on the roads was covered by these railway associated concerns." There are also charts and other details showing how railway, road passenger and transport traffic, and the large banks are linked up one with the other by finance capital.

To those interested in the subjects both are useful pamphlets. They are priced at twopence each.

* * * * *

"Labour's Way to Peace," by Arthur Henderson, M.P. Published by Methuen & Co., 36, Essex Street, W.C.2. Price 2s. 6d.

"Labour's Way to Peace," by Arthur Henderson, is one of a series of books in which prominent members of the Labour Party explain its policy for the next election.

Mr. Henderson states his case far more clearly than do other contributors on the different aspects of Labour Party policy in this "Labour Shows the Way" series. He has great faith in the League of Nations; it is, "in Labour's view, the beginning of a Co-operative World Commonwealth." This, of course, will be news to the capitalist countries who are members of the League of Nations. Further, "the Labour Government will pass a Peace Act of Parliament . . . to keep the peace by refraining from war or aggression . . . and severing all relations with a State that resorts to violence." If "Acts of Parliament" or "solemn declarations" could save the world from another capitalist war Mr. Henderson's book would be quite unnecessary. Why is it that more than twenty years since the

commencement of the last war, and after many pacts have been signed by capitalist countries "renouncing war," capitalist statesmen speak and act as though such renunciations were just so many empty platitudes? Italy is a member of the League of Nations, and recently the Italian Press threatened England with war, and boasted of how easily Italian aeroplanes could blow the English naval station of Gibraltar to smithereens. Japan was a member of the League of Nations, but when her warlike activities in Manchuria were censured by the League she merely withdrew her membership. Japan got her prize. The League kept its dignity—the new empire of Manchukuo should not be recognised.

Mr. Henderson's reasoning is a curious one—though quite consistent with Labour Party policy. He says: "The Labour Government would keep in closest touch with the United States and the Soviet Union with regard to a concerted attitude against aggression and the violation of treaties in the Far East. It would make clear that any fresh resort to war would be met by world-wide action on the basis of treaties forbidding war." This looks innocent enough. On this same question, however, Sir Stafford Cripps, a prominent member of the Labour Party, and member of its Executive Committee, speaking in the House of Commons on March 11th, 1935, said: "The Right Hon. Member for West Birmingham (Sir Austen Chamberlain) asked what would we have done as regards the Sino-Japanese dispute. As I understand it, when we signed the Covenant of the League of Nations we honestly meant to keep it . . . It was our duty in co-operation with the other nations who were equally bound, to do our utmost immediately that aggression became apparent to take every possible step to stop the aggression, in the first place, no doubt, by recalling the Ambassador, and if that failed, by economic pressure. *If that failed, 'hen in co-operation with other nations equally bound to take action, by armaments if necessary.'*" (Italics ours.)

This is apparently a blunter interpretation of Mr. Henderson's "concerted attitude," and "Labour's Way to Peace." The horrors of modern warfare would, apparently, be quite justifiable when sanctioned by the League of Nations. Incidentally, England, the United States and the Soviet Union have definite interests in the Far East. Is it beyond the mental capacity of some of the bright intellectuals of the "Socialist" League and the Labour Party to see that the Labour Party's policy is in line with the interests of the British Imperialism which they are so apt at denouncing?

Mr. Henderson goes almost warlike in threatening what will happen to any British Government which "resorts to war in defiance of its pledges to keep the peace." It would "be opposed by the united strength of the whole Labour movement."

This is either a bluff or Mr. Henderson does not know that an important section of the Labour movement, the T.U.C., has bluntly refused to commit itself to an anti-war policy in advance. Statements like the above were being made by Labour leaders just before the outbreak of war in 1914. It did not take most of them very long to completely change their minds. In particular, in 1917, Mr. Henderson was sent to Russia by the British Government to induce the Russian Government to remain in the war. Even if it were likely that the worker would be influenced by the fact of a war being sanctioned or not by the League of Nations, it is doubtful whether any capitalist Government would have much difficulty in persuading its workers that its own position was a righteous one, sanctioned by the League of Nations Covenant and, for that matter, by "God Almighty." The League of Nations has been a clearing house for the settling of minor disputes between capitalist countries. It cannot be more than that. When the interests and security of an established capitalist country are seriously threatened it is only logical that those capitalists will risk war, despite its horrors, in the defence of its interests. By going to war it would at least have a chance of saving its property. Not to do so would mean to lose it.

From a capitalist standpoint this is a logical attitude. The Labour Party's attitude is to be prepared to go to war only under the auspices of the League of Nations. The Socialist attitude differs fundamentally from both of these. A war is no less a capitalist war because it is engineered through the League; capitalism and capitalist interests are still the root cause and motive. One capitalist journal, the *Manchester Guardian*, has already hit upon the ingenious argument that Russia's membership of the League may justify regarding a League war as a Socialist war, but the working class, if they think clearly about their own interest and that of the Socialist movement, will reject all arguments, whether from avowed anti-Socialists or from the Labour and Communist Parties, which suggest supporting capitalist wars.

H. W.

ENTHUSIASM IN SHEFFIELD

Some four months ago the unemployed of Sheffield demonstrated against the new scales of relief introduced by the Unemployment Assistance Board. The protest, from righteous indignation, became a riotous proceeding. The police intervened and used their batons to gain control of the crowd. Many of the demonstrators were injured. Arrests were made and police court charges followed.

In the afternoon of Monday, April 29th, 1935, the centre of Sheffield was filled with an excited crowd of people. Workers from factories, shops

and offices. Scores of thousands of them. Also workers with no work at all.

Coats and caps were bedecked with "colours." Despite the crush, the utmost good humour prevailed; laughter greeted witty sallies; popular songs were sung.

As the appointed moment approached, the excitement became more intense. Everyone was tip-toe with expectancy. At last the waiting was over. The Heroes of the Hour were here. Sheffield almost rocked at the tremendous outburst of cheering.

Had the workers won a great concession? Had some new, far-reaching and hardly-fought-for reform been granted to them? Had the revolution come?

By no means. Sheffield Wednesday had returned from London with "The Cup."

If one had a cynical mind one might suggest that football has uses other than to provide the players with exercise.

L. W.

NEW PREMISES.

Appeal for Funds.—£300 Wanted.

The special meeting held on June 15th, to consider the question of obtaining new and larger premises to meet the growing needs of the Party dealt with the question of raising funds to cover the increased initial outlay. It was decided to appeal to members and sympathisers for £300, which is the amount estimated to be required as a minimum.

Those who have watched the expansion of Party work in recent years and the hampering effect of restricted accommodation will understand what an advantage it will be to get into larger premises. In time, as our membership and activities grow, the extra cost will not be unduly burdensome, but at the outset we shall have difficulty in making ends meet out of ordinary funds. If the response to our appeal is satisfactory we shall be able to get over this difficulty and obtain a Head Office which will be adequate for several years. Our future plans are consequently dependent on the amount of donations and the promptness with which they are sent in.

Please forward donations to Treasurer (Premises Fund), 42, Great Dover Street, S.E.1.

The Socialist Party: its Principles and Policy

Price 2d. (post free 2½d.)

Send your orders to the Literature Secretary, 42, Great Dover Street, London, S.E.1

"SOCIALISM AND RELIGION"

48 pages.

TWOPENCE

2½d. post free.

Open Air Meetings (London)

Sundays:

Finsbury Park	6 p.m.	Church Lane, Tooting	11.30 a.m.
Regents Park	11.30 a.m.	Park Avenue, Longbridge Rd. (nr. Barking Park)	8 p.m.
Clapham Common	6 p.m.	Whipps Cross	7.30 p.m.
Avenue Road, Clock Tower, Lewisham ...	8 p.m.	Brockwell Park	6 p.m.
Ridley Road, Dalston	8 p.m.	Cock Hotel	8 p.m.
Victoria Park	5 p.m.		
Queens Road, Bayswater	8 p.m.	Southend Sea Front (commencing June 30th) ...	6 p.m.

Mondays:

Ridley Road, Dalston, E.8 8 p.m.

Wednesdays:

Deanery Road, Water Lane, Stratford 8 p.m. Highbury Corner, N.5 8 p.m.
Hackney Town Hall 8 p.m.

Thursdays:

Ridley Road, Dalston, E.8. 8 p.m. "Salmon and Ball," Bethnal Green, E. 8 p.m.

Saturdays:

London Rd., Wembley (nr. L.M.S. Stn.), High Rd. 7.30 p.m. Ilford Station 8 p.m.
Jolly Butchers Hill 8 p.m. Church Hill, Walthamstow 8 p.m.

BRANCH DIRECTORY

BATTERSEA.—Sec., 2, Hanbury Road, S.W.11. Branch meets Thursday, 8.30 p.m., at The Waiting Room, Latchmere Baths, entrance in Burns Road.

BIRMINGHAM.—Sec., E. Jesper, 38, Rollason Road, Erdington. Branch meets Jeans Café, Newton Street. First Wednesday in month at 8 p.m.

BLOOMSBURY.—Branch meets every Monday at 7.30 p.m., at A.E.U. Hall, 39, Doughty Street, W.C. (Near Grays Inn, Road.) Sec., S.P.G.B., 39, Doughty Street, W.C.1.

CENTRAL.—Membership obtained only through the Ex. Committee. Applications to General Sec.

CHISWICK.—Branch meets Fridays, 8 p.m., at Chiswick Club, over 376, High Road, Chiswick, W.4. Communications to Sec., C. Curtis, 52, Parkstead Road, Putney, S.W.16.

DAGENHAM.—Sec. H. Berry, 5, Cannington Road, Dagenham. Branch meets alternate Saturdays (from 15th June) at above address. Discussion after branch business.

ECCLES.—Branch meets 1st and 3rd Mondays in month at Railway Temperance Room, Four Bridges, Wellington Road, 8 p.m. Discussion after Branch business. Non-members invited. Secretary, Mrs. F. Lea, 5, Gaskell Road, Eccles, Lancs.

EDINBURGH.—Communications to Sec., D. Lamond, at 15, Barclay Place.

GLASGOW.—Branch meets every Tuesday at 7.30 p.m. at McLean Memorial Hall, Salt Market, Glasgow. Communications to T. N. Walshe, c/o Falconer, 100, Naburn Street, C.5.

HACKNEY.—Branch meets Friday, 7.30 p.m., at Old Gravel Pit Hall, Vallette Street, E.9. Lecture after each meeting. Communication to Sec., E. Chalkley, 21, Bridge Street, E.9.

ILFORD.—Branch meets Mondays at 8 p.m. at 142, Richmond Road. Discussion after Branch business. Communications to Sec., at above address.

ISLINGTON.—All communications to F. W., 92, Wellington Road, Holloway, N.7. Branch meets on Fridays at 8 to 10.30 p.m., at Room 4, Co-operative Hall, 129, Seven Sisters Road, N.

LEYTON.—Communications to Sec., Dick Jacobs, 12, Clifford Rd., Walthamstow, E.17. Branch meets Thursday, 8 p.m., at Trades Hall, Grove House, High Road, Leyton.

LEWISHAM.—Branch meets Thursdays, at 8 p.m., at The Anchor Club Room, Lewisham Road. Sec. N. Taylor, 5, Hawke Road, Upper Norwood, S.E.19.

MANCHESTER.—Branch meets fortnightly (Mondays) as from 14 Jan., at Craigwell Restaurant, Peter Street (entrance in South Street). Sec., B. A. Lee, 19, Emery Avenue, Chorlton, Manchester.

PADDINGTON.—Branch meeting held on 2nd Friday, and lecture with discussion on 4th Friday in each month, 8 p.m., in the guild room over "Co-op. Stores," 447, Harrow Road, W.10. Literature Sec., W. Veal, 73, Wornington Road, W.10.

ROMFORD.—Branch meets alternate Tuesdays at 8 p.m. commencing February 5th (open to public) at N.U.R. Club, Albert Road. Business followed by Lecture and discussion. Secy. P. Golding, "Basra," Boscombe Ave., Hornchurch.

SHEFFIELD.—Sec., G. H. Southey, 112, Pickering Road, Sheffield, 3. Branch meets alternate Mondays, 7.30 p.m. at Room 2, A.E.U. Institute, Stanley Street.

SOUTHEAST-ON-SEA.—Branch meets 1st and 3rd Wednesday in the month, at 8 p.m. at 6, Hermitage Road, Westoliff. Discussion after branch business. Non-members invited. Communications to Sec. at above address.

SOUTHWARK.—Branch meets Fridays at 8 p.m., 42, Great Dover St., S.E.1. Communications to Sec., at above address.

STEPNEY.—Sec., S. Goldstein, 18, Irene House, Flower & Dene Street, Stepney, E.1. Branch meets on Fridays, at 8 p.m., at Working Lads Institute (nr. Whitechapel Station).

TOOTING.—Branch meets 1st Sunday in the month, at 12 o'clock noon, at "The Springfield Social Club," 590, Garrett Lane, S.W.17. (Opposite Burntwood Lane). Sec., 174, Haydons Road, S. Wimbledon, S.W.19.

TOTTENHAM.—Branch meets 1st and 3rd Fridays in the month, 7, Bruce Grove, Room 2. Discussion after branch business. Public invited. Communications to C. Godfrey, 49, Napier Road, Tottenham, N.17.

WEST HAM.—Sec., P. Hallard, 22, Colegrave Road, Stratford, E. Branch meets Whitehall Schools, Parliament Place, Forest Gate, every Thursday at 8 p.m.

WEMBLEY.—Communications to H. G. Holt, 28, Charterhouse Avenue, Wembley, Middlesex. Branch meets every Friday at 8 p.m., at Cafe-Restaurant, over 170, High Road, Wembley. Discussion after branch business.

WOOD GREEN.—Communications to Sec. at 44, Boreham Road, Wood Green, N.22. Branch meets 2nd and 4th Wednesday in month at 8.30 p.m., Stirling House, Stuart Crescent.

Published by THE SOCIALIST PARTY of Great Britain, 42, Great Dover Street, London, S.E.1, and Printed for them by E. B. TAYLOR & SON, Ltd., 54/57, Banner Street, London, E.C.1. (r u.)

THE SOCIALIST STANDARD

The Official Organ of **THE SOCIALIST PARTY** of Great Britain.

No. 372. Vol. 31]

London, August, 1935

[Monthly, Twopence

*Discover . .
what will .
destroy life,
and you are
a great man.*
—LORD LYTTON

PAWNS IN ABYSSINIA

IT is evident that the Italian Government is determined, at whatever the cost in men and money, to force big concessions from the independent State of Abyssinia, including, no doubt—if things go according to the Italian plans—the annexation of a large part of Abyssinian territory and the establishment of some form of close control over the remainder of the country. Why Mussolini's Government is prepared to go to war can be explained on the usual grounds. Notwithstanding the Fascist promise of a new economic system, Italian industry is carried on for profit in competition with the rest of the capitalist world, and Italy's lack of raw materials in her own territory or colonies places her capitalists

at a disadvantage in the scramble for profit. Abyssinia is coveted because, among other attractions, it would provide a market for Italian goods and cheap supplies of raw cotton, which would free Italian capitalists from the need to import from America. The excuse is often used by the Great Powers when annexing the territories of

native races that the backwardness of the latter is withholding from the civilised world much-needed sources of supply, without any advantage to the natives themselves. In the war to conquer Abyssinia that excuse cannot very well be used. Nobody can argue that the outside world is being hampered by scarcity of cotton. On the contrary, one of the outstanding features of the depression has been the vast over-production of cotton in many parts of the world, and the expensive official schemes for destroying and restricting cotton crops. In short, the motive which sends a gigantic military force into Abyssinia is not economic, in the sense of a genuine need of the human race, but is purely capitalistic, the lust for profit in a world divided into antagonistic capitalist-national groups. So, if Italy wins and further develops cotton-growing there, the next world economic crisis will very probably see the Italian Government restricting the production of that article, after sacrificing lives innumerable to make the development possible. Other attractions in Abyssinia are gold, rubber, copper, potash, and platinum.

Unrest in Italy

There are other reasons also. The early enthusiasm for Fascism began long ago to wear off, and there have recently been reports of strikes and demonstrations, including some against the threatened war. Poverty and unemployment for the workers are the order of the day under the Fascist flag, as under all others, and faced with discontent, Mussolini, like many a doomed dictator before him, is grasping at military glory as a means of regaining popular support. Naturally, he pretends otherwise, and claims that all but a tiny majority

ON OTHER PAGES

	Page
Meetings and Lectures	179
The Future of Palestine	180
A Fruitless Recipe ...	182
Three Hundred Pounds	183
Labour Party Dissensions...	184
Major Douglas in Alberta ...	185
Notes by the Way ...	186
Socialism and the Co- operative Movement	188
Disarmament and the Working Class ...	189
Twenty-one Years Ago	190
Answers to Corres- pondents ...	191

of the Italian population are behind him. Nevertheless, according to the Geneva correspondent of the *Daily Telegraph* (July 17th), he takes the precaution of imposing a much more drastic control of the frontier passes leading into Switzerland, with the two-fold object of preventing the escape of men who do not want to fight and of preventing the importation of anti-war and anti-Fascist propaganda leaflets and journals.

From a military point of view, while all the advantages of money and armaments are with the Italian forces, the deserts and mountainous country will be comparatively easy to defend, and the weather will be against the invaders. While opinion generally is that in time Abyssinia would be crushed, the task may prove so slow and costly that the Italian capitalists may well come to regard Mussolini as an expensive luxury. According to Mr. Vernon Bartlett (*News-Chronicle*, July 25th), "It is true—even though it be denied—that exactly a year ago important Army officers were alarmed to learn that Signor Mussolini contemplated an Abyssinian campaign They advised against it, a commission on the spot advised against it. . . ."

The defeat of an Italian force by the Abyssinians at Adowa in 1896 led to the overthrow of the then Italian Premier, Crispien. Will history repeat itself?

Something Rotten in the State of Abyssinia

Mussolini's appeals to the Italian workers to sacrifice their lives in a quarrel which does not concern them are paralleled by those of Emperor Haile Selassie. Although the country has made only small advances towards capitalist industrialism, and that only in limited areas, it has its evils no less than those of the capitalist Powers. Chattel slavery still exists, and is only slowly giving place to wage-slavery. There is desperate poverty on the one hand, face to face with the wealth and power of the ruling class on the other. It is true, as the Emperor says, that "throughout their history they have seldom met with foreigners who did not desire to possess themselves of Abyssinian territory, and to destroy their independence," but independence means no more to the subject class in Abyssinia than it does elsewhere. Moreover, much of the tribal territory held by Abyssinia was grabbed by the Emperor's predecessors, and is now held by force against the wishes of the local population. It is one of the ironies of the situation that just as Mussolini is afraid of discontented workers at his back, so the Emperor has to take extreme precautions that the arms he imports do not on the way fall into the hands of his own unwilling subjects, who would use them to revolt against him.

Haile Selassie's command over the kind of phrases to delude his subjects into fighting their

masters' wars is hardly less than that of Mussolini himself: "He who dies for his country is a happy man"—"It is better to die free than live as slaves" (a little inappropriate perhaps in a country where there are many slaves)—"God will be your shield. United with God, our ramparts and our shields will face to-morrow's invader with confidence. . . . Your sovereign will be in your midst and will not hesitate to shed his blood for Ethiopia. If no peaceful solution is found, Ethiopia will struggle to the last man for existence."

The religious note will be better understood when it is remembered that the Abyssinian priesthood are said to own as much as one-third of the total land, and are immensely influential.

The Attitude of the Powers

Many of the other Governments have direct or indirect interest in the situation. The Abyssinian Government has for many years tried to insure itself against occupation by one Power by giving contracts and concessions to companies belonging to several different countries. America, France, Japan, England, Belgium, Germany and Egypt are among the countries with trading or other important interests. Owing, however, to the complications of the European situation—in particular, the aim of keeping Austria apart from Germany, for which Italy's aid is essential—England and France would no doubt not be much disturbed at the idea of an Italian conquest of part of Abyssinia, provided that their own interests were safeguarded, along with Egypt's interest in Lake Tana, from which the Nile flows. However, not only has America indicated hostility to any Italian conquest, but the Japanese Government has taken the same line, and is allowing influential Japanese organisations to work up an agitation against Italy for the proposed "violation of international law and justice." The Japanese Government, which used the same methods in Manchuria and is now using them in China proper, is horrified that Italy should do this in Abyssinia.

A factor which may cause misgivings in many capitals is that any Abyssinian success may cause increased unrest throughout all the colonies in Africa.

It is worth remembering that Sir Samuel Hoare, British Foreign Secretary, has laid it down that Italy has a right to "expand," i.e., to conquer the territory of other nations (*Hansard*, July 11th, col. 517).

It is also worth remembering that, in order to buy Italy off, the British Government offered to give away some British territory in Somaliland, without asking the local inhabitants or the population at home.

What the final outcome of the complex clash of interests in Abyssinia will be, it is impossible to foretell.

A Crusade to Stop Slavery

One argument which generally plays a prominent part in the wars of annexation waged by the European States against the coloured races—that the war is a Christianising war—cannot be urged here, because the Abyssinian ruling class are Christians and have, indeed, themselves played the game of Christianising the Mohammedans. Mussolini has had to content himself with another noble-sounding slogan. He is going to rid Abyssinia of slavery, and impose by force the very doubtful advantages of Italian capitalist civilisation. The Pecksniffian leader writer of *The Times* (July 15th), while chiding Mussolini for his "obstinacy," tells us of some of the evils existing in the ancient empire of Abyssinia, or Ethiopia: "It is known . . . that conditions of squalor and extreme crudeness exist among the greater part of their quarrelsome tribes, some of whom still retain the belief that a man is no man until he has killed his enemy." The Abyssinians might retort that if there were no squalor already, conquest by any of the Powers would soon introduce it in large measure. Are not the notorious slums of the Italian towns squalid? And has *The Times* never heard of Britain's army of paupers, and the shocking conditions of the depressed areas? As for the ferocity of the tribesmen, who is Mussolini to complain? Has he not for years bellowed of the glorious uplifting qualities of war?

The Labour-I.L.P. Attitude

With their incurable weakness for sentimental phrases, the I.L.P. and Labour Party have discovered here another "poor little Belgium" being attacked by a big Power, and want to take sides with the Abyssinian ruling class against the Italian. The I.L.P. *New Leader* (July 19th) wants the British workers to refuse to make or transport arms or munitions for Italy. Nothing is said of arms for Abyssinia, so, presumably, the I.L.P. has no objection to the making of war material for the ruling class of that country. The Labour *Daily Herald* is more explicit, and printed an article from their correspondent in Abyssinia (July 24th), containing the following:—

It seems as if all that remains for the Abyssinians to do now is to sharpen their spears, clean their rifles and hope that Europe will let them buy ammunition, so that it may be a fair fight (italics ours).

Could anything better illustrate the hopelessly non-Socialist attitude of the little gentlemen of the *Daily Herald*? Here is a war about to take place between the exploiting class in two countries, one of which is more developed industrially than the other, and the organ of the Labour Party hopes that the slaughter of workers about a question which is not worth the life of a single one of them, shall be conducted on a "fair" basis, the only possible

result of which would be that the killing would be prolonged!

The Socialist attitude is quite unlike that taken up by the Labour Party and I.L.P. We do not take sides in ruling class quarrels. A story told of the Viennese during the battle of Sadowa is more in line with what should be the working class attitude. At that battle, which occurred in 1866, the Prussians and the Austrians were fighting out the issue which of the two ruling class groups should dominate the German States and Central Europe. It is said of the Viennese that, while the battle was in progress they went on dancing, "as if it did not matter which side won." They were right, and it would tax the ingenuity of all the assembled historians and apologists for war to show any tangible loss suffered by the mass of the Austrian population through the defeat.

The progress of the world, and the abolition of war can only come through Socialism. The duty of the working class is to press forward on that road, and not to be diverted by I.L.P.-Labour Party propaganda for this or that section of the ruling class. H.

BLOOMSBURY.

Lectures will be given on Monday evenings at A.E.U. Hall, 39, Doughty Street (Corner of Guildford Street), W.C.1. at 8.30 p.m.

Aug. 12	-	-	-	"From Keir Hardie to Maxton"
				A. KOHN.
" 19	-	-	-	"Can the Masses be Converted?"
				L. OTWAY.
" 26	-	-	-	"Science and Slaughter"
Sept. 2	-	-	-	"Eugenics and the Social Problem"
				W. JAMES.

Admission free. All invited. Questions and Discussion.

WEEK-END SCHOOL

Woodlands Holiday Camp,

Nr. Kingsdown, Kent.

AUGUST 24/25th.

Comrades who have booked for the Week-End School are advised to go by Green Line Coach from Victoria (Wrotham Route) at the following times, 1.45, 2.45, 3.45, etc. Alight at Kingsdown. Two miles walk to Woodlands.

For those who wish to attend on Sunday only, there will be a party on Sunday morning. Meet Holborn Viaduct, 9.30. Train to Otford. Fare 3/- return. A Lecture will be given on Saturday evening at 6 p.m.

Subject - "What is a Revolutionary Policy"

and another on Sunday at 3 p.m.

Subject - "Fascism"

The Future of Palestine

(Concluded)

THE Union of Zionist Revisionists make clear their capitalist aims for Palestine. They have planned an economic policy which, they say, is the best way of building a Jewish State in Palestine. In their pamphlet, entitled "Basic Principles of Revisionism," we read the following:—

The constructive period in the life of a State knows only one social commandment—the interests of the constructive work itself to which all other interests—whether of persons, groups or classes—must be subordinated—every class in society must be regarded as a cog in the constructional machine: their class interests must be satisfied when they benefit the State, but repudiated when they hinder the work of upbuilding the State...

Shades of Hitler and Mussolini! Are the revisionists ignorant of the State, its history and its functions? Is the State a mystical entity, above classes, and to which all classes are subordinated? Later on the Revisionists let the cat out of the bag when they tell us what the State is to do in the upbuilding of the new Jewish Society.

Similarly Jewish private capital, and State upbuilding are synonymous; but the payment of interest on private capital is the sine qua non of a supply of capital, hence any resistance to the payment of a legitimate interest on private capital is clearly in opposition to the State...

So here we see that the State is not absolutely divorced from classes and class interest. Obviously, if Jewish capital is synonymous with State upbuilding then it naturally follows that working-class interests are not going to be served by the State. The organised industrial activities of the working class must conflict with capitalist interests, and it will therefore be the function of the State machine, under the control of the Revisionists, to suppress the workers.

Other Revisionist writers make plain their intention to enforce subjection on the Palestine workers in the interest of Jewish capitalists.

Mr. A. Abrahams, in his pamphlet, "What Revisionism Stands For," remarks thus:—

It should be realised that only by assuring investors of the possibilities of profit can capital be attracted. Profitable industry can in no circumstances be associated with philanthropy, but must be in a position to make its way against ordinary competition in the world's markets...

Further, in their "Blue-White Papers," 1935, the Revisionists emphasise their attitude towards the class struggle.

Conflicts of interests between employers and labour should be settled by "obligatory national arbitration." By "national" arbitration we mean a permanent board of arbitrators (their italics) nationally and formally elected, and composed of persons known to have no *partisan idiosyncrasies* (our italics) ... its verdicts should be final; and both strikes and lock-outs (as well as the boycott of Jewish labour) should be declared treasonable to the interests of Zionism, and repressed by every legal and moral means at the disposal of the nation...

In regard to the "boycott" of Jewish labour, we can be sure that the Jewish capitalists in

Palestine will employ the cheapest labour suitable for their requirements, and will give preference to Arab labour if it is cheapest and as efficient.

The Jewish Daily Post (14/5/35) published the following report from Jerusalem:—

According to the Hebrew daily *Haarets*, Mr. Smilansky has issued a circular to the Farmers' Federation, urging them not to purchase shekolim as a protest against the resolution passed at the recent session of the Actions Committee that employment of Arab labour disqualifies a land owner from membership of the Zionist Organisation.

It is clear enough that for the workers Palestine—as far as the intentions of the Revisionists are concerned—is not to differ from other capitalist countries.

Poverty is not a Racial Question

The problem of Jewish poverty in Poland, Germany, England and elsewhere will not be solved by transferring them to Palestine, nor will it be solved by the charity of the Rothschilds and the Melchettts. Poverty is not a racial problem. It is a disability suffered by members of the working class in all parts of the world where capitalism exists, and it will only be removed by the establishment of Socialism.

It has been argued by the exponents of Zionism that the Jewish worker carries two burdens—the burden of exploitation and the burden of persecution. Zionism, it is claimed, will at least remove the burden of persecution. The whole argument is a fallacy. The greatest persecutions experienced by Jewish workers are the persecutions of capitalism. Many Jewish workers in Germany knew the terrors of unemployment long before the coming of Hitler. There are thousands of unemployed Jewish workers in this democratic country and many more thousands almost destitute in America and Poland. In Germany the Jews suffering from the Nazi régime are mainly doctors, lawyers, barristers, teachers, journalists, and those Jews who held prominent positions in the Civil Service. If there are any Jewish workers who dread losing their jobs under a Fascist Government they may be interested to read the following which appeared in a letter from a Manchester correspondent, and was published in a recent issue of the *Jewish Chronicle*. It refers to Poland.

During the last few years more and more clothing and weatherproof factories have been opened by Jews. Competition has become keener; prices have been cut to the very bone; and naturally the Jewish working man has suffered most. His wages have been reduced to the lowest level. He cannot exist on the meagre wage (often less than he would receive at the Labour Exchange) that he receives at these shops. Not only this, the Jewish-owned workshops have been flooded by Gentile labour from the closed cotton mills. The latter now receive preference in that the workshops are open on Saturdays and Jewish holy days, instead of, as previously, on Sundays. The key positions, too, the managements and the majority of clerical posts are entirely in the hands of non-

Jews (Jews in the office might learn too much of the business!) and an orthodox Jew who refuses to work on Saturday often finds a notice of dismissal in his pay envelope at the end of the week. Many of the owners of these workshops hold treasurerships and other high offices in our communal institutions...

Comment would be superfluous. We can only point out to the Jewish workers that nothing better awaits them in Palestine. Capitalism in England has given the workers of this country poverty, and the development of the system in Palestine will bring the same problems for the Jewish workers to solve. As in every other capitalist country, the production of goods will be limited by market requirements, and unemployment is inevitable. The Revisionists can give no guarantee of working class security and well-being.

The advantages of the Jewish workers in Palestine boil down to this. Instead of lining up outside a Labour Exchange in England, they will ask for a "dole" in a Palestinian Labour Exchange. Instead of being exploited in England, they will be exploited in Palestine. No longer will they run the risk of being beaten up by a Nazi hooligan, but they will have the proud privilege of knowing that they are being beaten by Jews in Brownshirts, members of the Union of Zionist Revisionists. (*The Jewish Daily Post*, 10/5/35, reports an occurrence in Vienna, when Revisionists smashed the furniture and destroyed the papers in the offices of a Jewish youth organisation with general Zionist sympathies, leaving behind them photographs of Dr. Weitzmann and Mr. Ben Gurion—Jewish Labour Leader—with the inscription "Weitzmann and Ben Gurion must hang.")

What, then, is to be the solution of the problems of the Jewish workers? We have already said that, in the main, these problems are the normal features of working-class life, poverty, insecurity, and premature death. While capitalism remains these vicious effects cannot be eliminated. Only the establishment of Socialism will remove them, and it will also remove anti-Semitism. Anti-Semitic agitation is used whenever it serves the interest of certain sections of the ruling class, just as anti-negro agitation is used in U.S.A.

Anti-Semitism is particularly severe in countries where there is still an ignorant and superstitious peasantry, but in the more developed capitalist countries conditions are not so favourable for the growth of anti-Semitic propaganda. The joint control of huge undertakings by Jewish and non-Jewish capitalists, the more experienced minds of the working class, all tend to weaken racial prejudice. There is also a larger proportion of Jewish workers in countries like England and America than there are in Germany. Even the final card of the Zionists, that a Jewish State in Palestine would afford the Jews security from pogroms can be answered. There is little danger from pogroms in advanced capitalist countries. Capitalism frowns upon civil violence. Anything

in the nature of riot and bloodshed upsets the delicate mechanism of capitalist trade and finance. It also disturbs confidence in the ability of the Government to keep order. For example, in a city like London, with its immense population, an anti-Jew riot might easily lead to the destruction of valuable property in which many non-Jewish capitalists are interested; and it would also be extremely difficult for the police to keep such a mob in hand. Even in Germany, at the height of the Nazi triumph, there were no pogroms of a Czarist Russian character.

In conclusion we must emphasise that the problem of the Jewish workers is not the illusory one of preserving their identity as a race, but to protect their interests as members of the working class, in whatever part of the world they find themselves.

Our message to the Jewish workers is no different to our message to any other national or racial section of the working class. We say to them that they should unite with us in the overthrowing of the capitalist system and the building of a new society, wherein they will be allowed to live freely, and in equality.

KAYE AND SCRUTATOR.

THE DROUGHT PERIL

The contradictions of capitalism and its disservice to the community are vividly shown in the method of handling the water shortage. Under a national system of society the available water could easily be stored and directed to the points where it is needed. Under capitalism, however, the god of private property is all-powerful, and so we read in the *News-Chronicle* of June 12th, 1935:

Many local authorities are handicapped by the unwillingness of owners of land with water sources to sell the water rights at a reasonable price. At present there are no powers to acquire such land compulsorily at an arbitration figure. R. M.

DONATIONS TO GENERAL FUNDS

S.C., 2s. 6d.; X.M., 2s.; S.A., 6d.; A.E.W., 3d.; G.E.S., 2s. 6d.; E.H., 14s. 8½d.; W.S., 2s. 6d.; Central, £1; W.I.G., 10s.; E.P., 3s. 6d.; I.W.C., 5s.; J.O., 11d.; F.N., 2s.; R.T., 4½d.; W.W., 2s. 6d.; S.W., 1s. 1d.; V.S., 1s. 1d.; R.G., 1s. 6d.; Coop., 1s.; J.C., 1s.; J.F., 5s.; A.P., 3s. 10d.; W.S., 2s. 6d.; A.K., 4s.; H.D., 14s. 6d.; J.C., 1s.; G.E.S., 2s. 6d.; H.R.B., 4s. 2d.; W.G.F., 2s.; R.W.H., 1s. 6d.; W.T.F., 1s. 6d.; R.E.W., 4d.; W.L.B., £1 1s.; F.W.W., 1s.; J.C., 1s. 4d.; M., 2s.; G.O.S., 10s.; G.E.S., 2s. 6d.; J.B., 3d.; Central, £2; C.J.H., 7s. 6d.; H.G., £1; C.C., 5s.; W.H.B., 1s.; P.W.C., 1s.; J.C., 1s.; W.W., 5d.; C.M.L., 1s.; Railway Clerks, 5s.; F.J.H., 5s.; J.O.M., 8d.; L.H., 17s. 6d.; O.C.I., £1; P.E., 4s.; R.I.M., 7s. 6d.; H.F.H., 1s. 9½d.; J.C., 2s.; Central, £2; A.P., 7s. 6d.; H.H., 2s.; C.O.G., £2 3s. 8d.; C., 1s.; W.L., 5s.; E.L., 9d.; F.C.B., 7d.; J.C., 1s. 9½d.; W.H.P., 2s. 6d.; Central, £1; A.B.D., 7s. 6d.; G.C., 2s. 6d.; Central, £1; A.J., 1s.

NEW PREMISES FUND

Bloomsbury Branch, £1; Wembley Branch, £2; H.O. Collection, £1 0s. 9d.; J. and C. Clarke, 5s. 6d.; S.B., 6d.; H.T., 4s.; Bloomsbury Branch, £1 0s. 6d.; Stepney Symp., 5s.; Stepney Branch, £1; B. Hill, £1; Ilford Branch, 10s.; Sale of Photos, £3; Westminster, £5; M.L., 10s.; A.M.P., £1.

A Fruitless Recipe

"How to Make a Revolution," by R. POSTGATE, (The Hogarth Press), 5s.

IT is difficult to recommend this volume to anyone seriously thinking of taking up revolution-making either as a hobby or as a full-time occupation. The author does not know how to make a revolution, and takes up the major portion of his book discussing methods which have failed.

Unlike the making of a Christmas pudding or a wireless set, the making of a revolution cannot be arranged beforehand, according to a recipe or blue-print. It can occur only as a result of certain conditions, and the author adds nothing to our knowledge and understanding of those conditions. On the contrary, he endeavours to belittle the value of those ideas of Marx which express a definite advance in knowledge and understanding. After a couple of pages of obscure verbiage, he concludes comfortably, "We have, then, to abandon the dialectic," and then goes on, "With slightly more hesitation we may reject also the whole system of Marxian economics" (p. 21). In other words, we are invited to revert to metaphysics once more (under the label of "psychology") and discard Marx for G. D. H. Cole.

Discussing the concentration of capital and the exploitation of the workers, he says: "These two facts are so obvious that Marxists economics are not required to prove them." (Italics mine.) This phrase illustrates Mr. Postgate's clumsiness of thought. Marx's economic theories are not intended to prove facts, but to explain them. Only understanding can enable us to deal with society as with nature in general. The importance of the theory of surplus-value to the workers lies in the fact that it alone explains how their exploitation takes place, and traces it to its source, i.e., the capitalist ownership of the means of production.

It is because the mass of the workers are still far from clear on these points that they continue to look to politicians for the supposed benefits of "prosperity," coupled with illusory "reforms."

Mr. Postgate rakes up afresh the boggy of the "middle-class" vote, and attributes the compromising tactics of the Labour Party to the inevitable necessity of conciliating this vote. On page 48 he makes the ridiculous statement that, "Wherever a Socialist (?) Party has approached near to office in an advanced industrial country the same thing has happened—in Italy, Germany, France, and Britain. In each country the Party has progressed a certain way with a genuinely Socialist or revolutionary programme, only to find that its further progress depended on a gradual abandonment of that programme." Anyone acquainted with the early history of the Labour Party knows that its principal Parliamentary leaders openly gained their "safe" seats on a Liberal programme, with

Liberal support. The failure of the Labour Party from the Socialist view-point is due, not to their inability to "convert" Acton and Ealing (as Mr. Postgate contends), but to their failure to educate the workers in predominantly industrial areas, Sheffield, for example, in the rudiments of Socialism. The significance of such an area returning the full complement of supporters of the National Government is obviously lost upon Mr. Postgate. The fact is that there are no safe Labour seats. All of them, having been won by compromising tactics, are liable to be swept back into the openly reactionary fold when a period of Labour Government has resulted in inevitable disillusion.

Failing to understand history in his own country it is, of course, too much to expect the author to grasp the meaning of events abroad. Hence, on page 50, he lets fall another fatuous remark: "The more realist Socialists of Italy and Germany will admit, to-day, that the Socialist Parties of those two countries had their opportunity to make a Socialist revolution; that they failed to take it and for that reason are extinct."

Were the representatives of these Parties ever sent to the seats of Government in order to establish Socialism? Nowhere does Mr. Postgate face up to this vital question. He thoughtlessly accepts the totally unwarranted assumption that parties elected for the purpose of achieving certain very limited reforms, can use their power to accomplish a social revolution. The Continental parties in the Second International have paid the penalty for having at the outset succumbed to the fatal delusion that it is the business of Socialists to play the paltry game of vote-catching in order to be able to assist the master-class in the administration of the present system.

In his concluding chapter, the author suggests the formation of yet one more organisation to reform (or should it be to "Bolshevise"?) the Labour Party. He considers that the next Labour Government should hold on to office till it has "made Socialism." He does not tell us what is going to happen when it fails to balance its Budget. He evinces an uncomfortable feeling that the Labour Party, like its brother Parties in Italy and Germany, is hardly likely to escape from the chain of its own history, and lugubriously asks his fellow Labourites how they would like to be beaten into a state of unconsciousness with a rubber baton.

It is amusing and instructive to reflect that this is the same Mr. Postgate who, a dozen years or so ago, was cheerfully editing the official organ of the Communist Party, encouraging the workers to adopt violent and unconstitutional methods.

Three Hundred Pounds

THESE words are addressed to those workers who want Socialism. Most of those who want Socialism and who agree that the method advocated by the Socialist Party of Great Britain for its adoption is the correct one, are already inside the ranks of the Party. There are others, however, who, whilst sympathising with our position, have not yet found their way to join with us in the organised work for Socialism. Whether inside or outside the Party, however, it will be obvious that, carrying on our work under capitalism, we need, if our work is to be effective, plenty of that exchange medium—Money.

Those who perused our last issue will have seen that our need is, at the moment, particularly urgent. We have to vacate our present, somewhat cramped, premises very shortly. The Party is growing, and in order to carry on efficiently the increased amount of work and the various new forms of activity, larger and more commodious premises are necessary. It is estimated that the minimum amount required to enable us to effect the removal and obtain a tenancy of the type of premises deemed most suitable is Three Hundred Pounds.

Now, fellow workers, it is up to you. If you want Socialism, then let us have the wherewithal. Those who have a banking account can send us a nice little cheque, or even a fat one, if your balance is well on the credit side. If you do not possess a banking account, there is a Post Office not so far away, who will kindly oblige with a postal order of anything from 6d. to 21s. in exchange for the necessary cash. If you cannot afford a postal order, even stamps will be welcome. If you are not in the Party, but know one of the comrades, he will gladly give you a receipt for your subscription, however small—but we would like it large, if possible! All donations sent to Headquarters will be acknowledged in the SOCIALIST STANDARD. Now, fellow-workers—step on it!

THE SOCIALIST STANDARD

Fill in and post to Literature Secretary, 42, Great Dover Street, London, S.E.1, and get this paper regularly.

Please send me THE SOCIALIST STANDARD regularly for 12 months, for which I enclose 2s. 6d. (for six months, 1s. 3d.)

Name

Address

For a person who rejects dialectics, Mr. Postgate has certainly done his best to illustrate in his own person the negation of negation. The part of his book dealing with Communist tactics is, as a consequence, the most entertaining. His summary of the slogans of the *Daily Worker* could hardly be improved upon: "Come out on strike! If you do, your leaders will instantly sell you out!"

Nevertheless, Mr. Postgate has merely exchanged one form of futility for another. He is by no means optimistic about the prospects of his proposed new organisation.

He "will not even permit himself to say with certainty that such an organisation will lead to a successful revolution." Apparently, he and others put the idea before the Socialist League two years ago without success. So that the "reform" of the Labour Party appears almost as remote as Socialism. And what is this, after all, but a re-appearance of the original idea of the I.L.P. in joining the Labour Party a generation back?

Experience answers Mr. Postgate. No group, however well-intentioned, can save a Party which adopts vote-catching as one of its methods; for the group must participate in the methods of the Party and, eventually, in its fate. E. B.

THE S.P.G.B. AND THE BOLSHEVIK SEIZURE OF POWER IN 1917

We have been asked the following question:—

What was the proposal of the S.P.G.B. to the Bolshevik Government as to what should be the mode of procedure after the Bolsheviks had achieved political power?

The question is evidently based on a misunderstanding of the attitude taken up by the S.P.G.B. It is not, and never has been, our view that the Bolshevik Government might have succeeded in establishing Socialism in Russia, or might have succeeded in engineering world revolution, if only it had adopted some policy different from the one it did adopt. On the contrary, our case has been, right from the outset 18 years ago, that the backward industrial development of Russia, and the very small number of Socialists both in Russia and in the rest of Europe, made it impossible for either of these two events to happen. It was not, therefore, a question of our telling the Bolsheviks what to do with power when they had achieved it. What we did tell them was that their hold on power would not bring Socialism, however they used their power, and that they were deceiving themselves and the working class in claiming otherwise.

Interested readers are referred to the articles published in the September, 1918, "S.S.," "The Russian Revolution—Where it Fails," and to numerous other articles in the years 1918-1921.

ED. COMM.

THE SOCIALIST STANDARD

AUGUST,



1935

OFFICIAL NOTICE

All communications for the Executive Committee. Subscriptions for the *SOCIALIST STANDARD*, Articles, and Correspondence submitted for insertion therein, should be addressed—The Socialist Party of Great Britain, 42, Great Dover Street, London, S.E.1, to whom Money Orders should be made payable.

The meetings of the Executive Committee are held at the Head Office, every Tuesday, at 7.30 p.m.

TERMS OF SUBSCRIPTIONS.

Twelve Months, post free 2s. 6d.
Six Months, post free 1s. 3d.

Labour Party Dissensions

NEARLY thirty years ago the Labour Party was formed out of the various organisations which had made up the Labour Representation Committee. Before the formation of the Labour Party, trade union leaders seeking to become members of Parliament did so mostly under the patronage of the Liberal Party. The change meant that there was now a working-class political organisation with trade union backing aiming to get control of the machinery of government in the interests of the working class—or so it appeared to its optimistic supporters.

Many thousands of working men and women believed that it provided the solution to their economic problems. With all its faults and limitations the early Labour Party was of a distinctly working-class character, and most of its prominent members were workers from the factory and mine. There were also a sprinkling of "intellectuals" and the inevitable political adventurer (Mr. R. MacDonald in his letter to Keir Hardie when applying for membership stated as his reason for joining the Labour Party the fact that the Liberal Party would not choose him as a candidate for Parliament!).

Time has brought changes. The Party has grown, has been the Government and has tasted the sweets of office. Many of its prominent members whose chests in their youth wore the sashes of their trade unions, now wear the decorations of another sort. A few erstwhile "reds" and "enemies of society" have reached the House of Lords. Much anxiety is shown on the important questions of what to

wear for royal and State functions by former working men who in the 'eighties were anxious about obtaining a "tanner" a day for the dockers.

That the Labour Party is not, and never was a Socialist party we have shown all along. Nevertheless, it was quite probable in its early days that many of its leaders believed it to be the only party which the worker, in his own interests, could support. To-day, however, after holding the reins of office, the appearance of the Labour Party to its members has changed considerably. A series of incidents connected with a by-election at Putney in November, 1934, illustrate this change.

Putney had always been regarded by the Labour Party as a "middle class" area, and its candidates had never been successful there. When the seat at Putney became vacant the Labour Party's candidate was a Mr. Mander who had been chosen by the local organisation twelve months earlier. Other by-elections in 1934 in areas similar to Putney caused officials of the Labour Party to believe that their chances of success were considerably improved, partly because there had arisen quite a lot of anxiety about war. Despite its own war-time record, and relying on the proverbial short political memory of working-class electors, the Labour Party came out as a party of peace, and exploited the peace sentiment for all it was worth. The chances of success at Putney having improved, high officials of the Party intervened and persuaded Mr. Mander—not without the use of pressure—to stand down in favour of another candidate. Members of the Putney Labour Party resented the back-door methods used to induce Mander to stand down. They also flatly refused to accept as their candidate the nominee of the officials, a Mr. Bowles, whose claims for fitness to represent the Labour Party in Parliament, according to statements submitted by the officials to the Putney Labour Party, were his wealth, his financial connections in the City and the numerous motor-cars at his command. The Putney Labour Party was successful in thwarting the Headquarters officials, but the result was that the Putney Party was suspended.

Many lessons are to be learned from the Putney by-election. The Labour Party has reached the stage at which it is unwilling to be associated with ideas of destroying the private property rights of the capitalist class. Its chief business more than ever now is to get itself elected. It chooses its programme of social reforms solely with an eye to getting votes. In this it is little different from the openly capitalist parties.

There are, of course, members of the Labour Party who criticise the way the machine is run, among them the expelled members of the Putney group. They say that they do not want the Party to seek electoral success on a non-Socialist programme, nor do they want candidates foisted on the local organisations by the Headquarters officials.

Major Douglas in Alberta

AN interesting situation has arisen in Alberta with the acceptance by Major Douglas of post as adviser to the Government. The

Government in the province is in the hands of the Party known as the United Farmers of Alberta, whose hold on the electorate has been seriously undermined by the rapid growth of a local Social Credit League run by a Mr. Aberhart. Fearful of being defeated at the next elections the Government, in the words of the Canadian correspondent of the *Economist*, "hit upon the idea of importing Major Douglas himself, the parent of Social Credit, to confound Mr. Aberhart" (*Economist*, June 29th).

Major Douglas and Mr. Aberhart have said some harsh things about each other, and each claims that his particular scheme is the genuine article, so that it seems highly probable that the move of the Alberta Government will succeed in splitting the Social Credit vote. Major Douglas is not giving his aid for nothing. He is to have a "generous fee." According to the *Vanguard* (Toronto, June 1st, 1935) he gets a retaining fee of 5,000 dollars and a further payment of 2,000 dollars for every visit to Alberta.

He has recommended the formation of a coalition Government which shall seek a mandate for the following four "fundamental objectives" (*Economist*, June 29th).

A drastic reduction of taxation, particularly upon property.

A maintenance dividend as of right, probably small at first, and graded so as to be at the maximum

THE SOCIALIST PARTY OF GREAT BRITAIN

OBJECT.—The establishment of a system of society based upon the common ownership and democratic control of the means and instruments for producing and distributing wealth by and in the interest of the whole community.

DECLARATION OF PRINCIPLES

THE SOCIALIST PARTY of Great Britain HOLDS—

1. That society as at present constituted is based upon the ownership of the means of living (i.e., land, factories, railways, etc.) by the capitalist or master class, and the consequent enslavement of the working class, by whose labour alone wealth is produced.

2. That in society, therefore, there is an antagonism of interests, manifesting itself as a class struggle, between those who possess but do not produce, and those who produce but do not possess.

3. That this antagonism can be abolished only by the emancipation of the working class from the domination of the master class, by the conversion into the common property of society of the means of production and distribution, and their democratic control by the whole people.

4. That as in the order of social evolution the working class is the last class to achieve its freedom, the emancipation of the working class will involve the emancipation of all mankind without distinction of race or sex.

5. That this emancipation must be the work of the working class itself.

6. That as the machinery of government, including the armed forces of the nation, exists only to conserve the monopoly by the capitalist class of the wealth taken from the workers, the working class must organise consciously and politically for the conquest of the powers of government, national and local, in order that this machinery, including these forces, may be converted from an instrument of oppression into the agent of emancipation and the overthrow of privilege, aristocratic and plutocratic.

7. That as all political parties are but the expression of class interests, and as the interest of the working class is diametrically opposed to the interests of all sections of the master class, the party seeking working-class emancipation must be hostile to every other party.

8. **THE SOCIALIST PARTY** of Great Britain, therefore, enters the field of political action determined to wage war against all other political parties, whether alleged labour or avowedly capitalist, and calls upon the members of the working class of this country to muster under its banner to the end that a speedy termination may be wrought to the system which deprives them of the fruits of their labour, and that poverty may give place to comfort, privilege to equality, and slavery to freedom.

Those agreeing with the above principles and desiring enrolment in the Party should apply for membership form to secretary of nearest branch or at Head Office.

They want men chosen by themselves for their principle, not for their wealth and social standing. All of which sounds very well, but is really an empty dream. A movement such as the Labour Party can be successful or unsuccessful at elec-

tions according to the swing of the political pendulum and the nice choice it exercises in drawing up its programme, but it cannot turn itself into a Socialist Party. Its membership and officials, its funds and its structure are what they are because of the theories on which the Party has been built up. It cannot cut itself off from its past and become something entirely different. Even were it possible for the Party now to be run in the way the Putney rebels say they desire—on a strictly Socialist non-reformist programme—that would be the end of the Party. It would disappear as the largest opposition Party and potential future Government, and its millions of votes would attach themselves elsewhere, to a Party offering the reforms they have been taught by the Labour Party (and by the Putney group) to value. The Putney rebels are deceiving themselves. Their choice is not between running the Labour Party as a great vote-catching machine or running it as if it were a Socialist Party, for the latter is impossible. If they want the kind of immediate electoral success the Labour Party offers they must seek it in the Labour Party and work for it by the methods they profess to dislike. If, on the other hand, they want Socialism they must seek it in the Socialist Party of Great Britain.

after middle age.

Measures designed to produce a low price level within the Province with adequate remuneration to the producer and trader.

Development of internal resources based upon "physical capacity rather than upon financial considerations."

It will be noticed that these objectives might be accepted easily by any Liberal-Labour Party anywhere. Where they are definite they are in line with capitalism. Where they are vague they are good vote-catching devices.

What is important about the Alberta episode is that it exposes the real nature of the Douglasite gospel. Major Douglas and his followers are most emphatic that their scheme is not inflation of the currency, but that, in fact, is precisely what it is. The whole Douglas theory is based on an ancient myth about a supposed deficiency of purchasing power. There is no such deficiency, and consequently the issue of Social Credit in the form of the payment of an allowance to all citizens, since it is not to be provided by increased taxation, could only be done by inflating the currency and thus causing the price level to rise. Major Douglas is most anxious to deny this because experiences of inflation in France, Germany and elsewhere have shown how useless that is except for the problems of certain sections of the capitalist class. Now we find him acting as adviser to the United Farmers of Alberta, one of the planks of whose programme, adopted at a conference two or three years ago (see *Canadian Annual Review*, 1933), is inflation of the currency to bring the dollar down to the level of the wheat-producing foreign competitors of the Alberta farmers! Like certain English economists who have been prepared to give conditional support to the Douglas scheme, the Alberta farmers will be willing to do so simply because

it involves currency inflation which they believe will help to reduce the burden of their indebtedness to the Canadian banks, mortgage companies and insurance companies.

Douglas—Defender of Capitalism

Before leaving Major Douglas it may be worth while to remind those misguided workers who support him how essentially capitalistic is his movement. He is himself an unrepentant anti-Socialist. In his "Monopoly of Credit" (Chapman & Hall, 1931) he describes the relationship between capitalists and workers as "a perfectly equitable arrangement" (p. 34) and in his Draft Social Credit Scheme for Scotland he emphasised that there was to be no "interference with existing ownerships, so called," and there would continue to be profits, wages and capitalist ownership (see appendix to "Social Credit," revised edition, 1933, Eyre & Spottiswoode). He constantly puts forward the absurd theory—but a very useful one to the industrial and commercial capitalists in hoodwinking the workers—that capitalists and workers are both exploited and impoverished by their common enemy, the banker. One of the journals which espouses his cause, the *New English Weekly*, tells us (May 26th, 1932) that Douglasism could be introduced only under two forms of government

A dictatorship . . . or a Patriotic Government largely and predominantly composed of "Tory aristocrats."

On January 26th, 1933, the same paper had the following frank admission about the aims of the Douglas movement:—

. . . if by capitalism is understood the system of competitive production for profit, it can be said that the required change would not involve its destruction but only its regulation. H.

Notes by the Way

Indian Offer to Occupy Belfast

It is often urged in defence of the British occupation of India that the Indians are unable to keep the peace among themselves. Hindoos, Sikhs, and Mohammedans are sometimes on such bad terms with each other about religious and other differences that riots occur and lives are lost. The British authorities then step in and try to keep the peace. This is all very well, but what are the Indians supposed to think about the recurrent riots in Belfast, where Protestants are now refusing to work alongside Catholics, demand the dismissal of the latter, and mob those who do not at once clear out. Several lives have been lost, and many persons have been injured. Troops had to be called out to patrol the streets.

We are waiting to hear that the Indian National Congress has offered to occupy and pacify Belfast.

Irish Gentility

Southern Ireland also is determined not to be out of the picture, and with fierce conflicts between the police, farmers' mothers, wives, and daughters at Cork, is establishing its right to be regarded as a civilised nation. The following is taken from a report by the Cork correspondent of *The Times* (July 13th) of riots between farmers' wives, mothers and daughters and the police, when an attempt was being made to sell up farmers' stock for payment of land annuities to De Valera's Government:—

Some of the women were black and blue with the handling they got. They were driven back time after time, but re-formed in massed formation and charged the police. They captured helmets and caps, and brought them back as trophies. Then they threw them back to the police, charged again, and recaptured them. The women had a banner, which was taken by the police; but the women recaptured it. Women were sent staggering with punches. Eight women were taken inside the gates under arrest, and the battle subsided for ten minutes or so. Women

reinforcements arrived with baskets of eggs and the police were bespattered from head to foot. There was a baton charge and the women cleared away, but not before some were injured.

Mr. De Valera, who is unable to prevent these riots in Southern Ireland, nevertheless, accuses the English Government of being responsible for the riots in Belfast!

The Boll-Weevil Problem

The Boll-Weevil is a pest which attacks and destroys cotton crops. The United States Government, in accordance with the vicious nonsense which masquerades as economics in capitalist circles, is also engaged in destroying or, rather, restricting the cultivation of cotton in order to keep the price up. The same Government employs a large body of men to help kill the boll-weevil, and large sums of money are spent killing it with calcium arsenate. A correspondent of the *Manchester Guardian* (July 17th) says that people in the cotton areas are asking: "Why kill bugs and at the same time resort to artificial means for crop reduction?" The *Manchester Guardian* answers the question by pointing out that the individual grower may want the total output of cotton restricted, but wants his own crop preserved. That is so, but whichever way the situation is regarded, it is a splendid example of the shocking lunacy of capitalism.

Who said That?

Students of politics and politicians can guess who said:—

We are leaving no stone unturned gradually to raise the workers' standard of living. (*Times*, July 1st.)

You will rightly answer that it is a record played on all the capitalist gramophones, from Tokyo to Montreal, and from Pole to Pole. Actually, these words were used by one of the late-comers, Hitler's right-hand man, Dr. Goebbels. Anyone who still had any lingering suspicion that the Nazis might try to do something for the German workers must, in face of these words, now know that they will do nothing whatever.

The Excuse for Fascism and Nazism

The Nazis in Germany came to power partly through the clever exploitation of a supposed Bolshevik danger. The man who taught them this trick, Benito Mussolini, has admitted (according to Mr. Wickham Steed *Observer*, June 30th), that his similar story about Italy was utterly false.

On July 2nd, 1921, Mussolini wrote an article in the *Popolo d'Italia* containing the passage:—

To say that a Bolshevik danger still exists in Italy means taking base fears for reality. Bolshevism is overthrown.

Mussolini then proceeded to work up a panic about this non-existent danger, as a means of gaining power. When, later on, his attention was

called to his double-faced attitude, he replied:—

What I wrote then was true, but it is also true that I climbed into power on the shoulders of those who thought there was a Bolshevik danger.

It is always a sound policy to be suspicious of a known bandit who implores you to let him protect you from some danger supposed to be threatening you.

The Industrial Research Racket

Employers have always been interested in the discovery of ways of reducing the amount of labour required to produce each unit of the product in which they are interested. They have also always considered it useful to obscure their motive—the search for additional profits—with talk of workers' welfare. Nowadays in the most highly industrialised nations, the whole process has been organised in Governmental and private bodies, which profess to be interested in the scientific study of labour processes, the relationship between hours and conditions of work, and the functions of the human body, and the suitability of the individual worker for particular kinds of work.

Whatever may be the intentions of the individuals responsible for these organisations, and whatever incidental increase of knowledge may result from their efforts, such bodies, in the lump, are absolutely fraudulent. Because industry is controlled by the capitalists and their agents, and operated for profit, these industrial research organisations are only called in by the employer to serve some need of his. The claim of independence and neutrality as between employer and employed is a hollow one. There is a simple test. Let any of these organisations give a single instance of the workers in a factory being allowed to call in research experts to examine the competence, suitability, intelligence, etc., of the directors and shareholders of the company, and their claim to the fees and dividends they receive. This never happens because the object of such investigations is not and cannot be, under capitalism, a disinterested search for truth, it must always be directed to promoting the interests of the profit-seeking class, who own and control.

Evidence of Returning Prosperity

Under the above heading the *Daily Telegraph* (July 25th) describes how "The prosperity tide is flowing strongly again." Elsewhere in the same issue are the latest figures of the number of persons receiving poor relief. In England and Wales on January 1st of this year the number was 1,472,891, an increase of 70,166 over January, 1934. The pre-war figure (January 1st, 1914) was 761,578. (See *Statistical Abstract*, 1935, p. 83.)

Looking at profits instead of pauperism there is more justification for the *Daily Telegraph's* view. The *Economist's* index of profits shows a continuous and substantial increase each quarter since

the end of 1933. 694 companies, which published their reports during the quarter ended June 30th, showed total net profits (after payment of debenture interest, etc.) of £80 millions, and paid an average of 6.7 per cent. on their ordinary shares (*Economist*, July 13th).

* * *

Progress or Only Promises?

Lord Trent, head of Boots, the Chemists, addressing the Royal Sanitary Institute Health Congress, at Bournemouth, on July 18th (see report in *Times*, July 19th), said some sound things about the conditions of working-class life, marred, however by a quite unfounded optimism. He said that "the practice prevailing last century" was that "of treating labour as a commodity by hiring in the cheapest market and casting aside when done with." No one will dispute that. His second claim was that "there existed in this country a growing body of employers . . . who held very definitely the view that there was an obligation upon them to give their employees the widest possible opportunities for making the best of their lives." He then went on to say that the above obligation "involved a very considerable departure from the practice prevailing last century." This brings us to the important question, whether in truth the present practice is any different from that of a century ago. Granting for the sake of argument that employers hold the view attributed to them, can it be said that it makes any difference to their conduct? If Lord Trent thinks it does will he explain how it is that we have seen during the past crisis three millions of workers cast aside by employers who no longer wanted them?

Socialism and the Co-operative Movement

(Report of an address by an S.P.G.B. speaker on July 9th at Co-operative Hall, Seven Sisters Road to members of the Islington Co-operative Guild) S.P.G.B. address: There is to-day a crying need for Socialism. In the depressed areas of northern England, in the heavy industries, such as coal, iron and shipbuilding, we behold the usual scene of the wholesale dismissal of workers under capitalism. Coal miners with no work while mines stand idle; textile workers unemployed while mills are closed; shipwrights despairing for the future while many ships ply the seas in a state of disrepair, and with the minimum of comfort for the crew. Men and women are denied all these, as well as other means of living, though they could themselves produce their own means of existence if allowed access to the means of production.

These facts were observed by Utopian Socialists more than a century ago. But they were groping in the dark; they did not fully

Either the employers have not changed their hearts or, if they have, capitalism has prevented them from giving expression to the change by treating the workers differently. In either case Lord Trent's assumption that capitalism will remedy the workers' problems is shown to be unjustified.

* * *

Major Douglas's Little Joke

When Major Douglas and other Social Credit illusionists are asked why it is that banks pay such small dividends compared with the more profitable of the industrial and commercial concerns, seeing that, according to Douglas, they have the power to "create credit" without limit, and thus make profits of hundreds per cent., their reply is that the banks pay moderate dividends for reasons of policy, "for fear of attracting too much attention." (See *Social Credit*, 1933 Edition, p. 157.)

In 1935 (see *Times*, July 25th), five overseas banks paid no dividend at all, and numbers paid 2 per cent., 3 per cent., and other small amounts up to 10 per cent. It is highly diverting to be told by Major Douglas that bank shareholders, "for fear of attracting too much attention," rest content with no dividends at all, while Great Universal Stores pays 45 per cent., Beecham's Pills 27½ per cent., Prices, Tailors, 65 per cent. (they own "The 50/- Tailors"), Eastwood Flettons 166½ per cent., Woolworth's 70 per cent., and the Insurance Companies from 25 per cent. to 100 per cent.

Major Douglas had better think up some more plausible argument—or, better still—scrap the great superstition about "credit creation" and start studying the subject. H.

understand the working of the capitalist system. Fourier, for example, was very enthusiastic over a system of co-operative colonies, which, he said, would grow with great speed. Robert Owen also confidently expected that co-operative productive societies would sweep the country within his own lifetime. Why, then, is it that more than a century after co-operative productive and distributive societies began to work, no great impression has been made on the capitalist system?

After one hundred years of striving, the Co-operative Societies employ only a quarter of a million people in their productive concerns, where the average wage is a mere £3 per week. In the distributive side of the Co-operative Societies the average wage of employees is even less—£2 15s. per week. The Co-operative movement has departed from the ideals of Fourier and Robert Owen, and as its supporters themselves admit, it has to compete with other firms run on capitalist lines. That is why Co-operative employees have to strike

against bad conditions of employment, taking part in the class struggle just as workers in other firms do. Many Co-operators still believe that the Co-operative Societies will be the means of emancipating the working class. But the conditions prevailing in the Co-operative Societies expose this hope as baseless. The facts go to show that the Co-operative movement is perfectly content to run on capitalist lines. For that reason its directors invested large sums in War Loan, and helped the capitalist class to continue the Great War, though it probably meant the murder or maiming of Co-operative members in the fighting forces. In spite, however, of the Co-operative Societies' willingness to be patriotic, people like Lord Beaverbrook attacked them. Therefore, the Co-operative movement, in self-defence, set up its own political party to make itself a political force in the country. Not with a view to getting rid of the wage-slave system, but only to continuing capitalism—and the Co-operative Societies. This is made clear by their statement (in the *People's Year Book*, 1932), that their Party will strive for more Public Utility Boards, such as the London Passenger Transport Board—which was recently faced with a strike of thousands of its 'bus drivers and conductors.

The action of the Co-operative Societies in trying to get political power is an admission of the supreme importance of that power, and shows that the Co-operative movement is beginning to realise that the working class cannot get its emancipation

while the Government is in the hands of the capitalist class.

(This concluded the address.)

Many questions were asked and apparently almost every member of the audience wanted to take part in the discussion. But the divergence of opinion shown within this Co-operative Guild is astounding in an organisation which claims that it will transform society. One member said that Parliament was no good; another said that the Co-operative Societies must seek protection in Parliament. It was maintained, on the one hand, that the Co-operative Societies would expand and overthrow the capitalist system; while another member declared that big finance was the greatest power in the world, and admitted, when questioned, that it could destroy the Co-operative movement. Another participant in the discussion said that it was not true that the members of the Co-operative Societies were interested only in the dividend; but went on to say that though possibly most of their members did buy at Co-operative stores because of the "divi," that was because we were living under capitalism.

Many other mistaken ideas were expressed, as for example, that the S.P.G.B. is in opposition to Trade Unions. As regards the Trade Unions, we point out that the working class must organise to resist the encroachments of their masters, but that such organisation cannot achieve Socialism.

D. S.

Disarmament and the Working Class

OF the numerous problems which owe their existence to the normal development of Capitalism, that of Disarmament seems to have outstripped all others in the degree of popularity. For many years organisations from the League of Nations Union down to the Labour Party and Christian Peace Societies have wasted their time, money, and energies in conducting Peace by Disarmament Propaganda campaigns, passing futile resolutions, futile because they lacked effective backing, even if such were practicable, and generally calling upon the Government of the day to give a lead to the remaining capitalist world in the attainment of disarmament.

The Government, however, ignoring the pleas of the ardent pacifists, is busily engaged in making its contribution to world peace by preparing the armed forces for war.

This policy, together with the identical one now being pursued by the rest of capitalist States, has been instrumental in changing pacifist optimism into unprecedented pessimism.

Their failure to appreciate the function of Government and armed forces is the main cause of their defeat.

Whilst not agreeing with Bukharin in other matters, we can certainly endorse the following:—

It ought to be obvious from the foregoing considerations that armaments are an indispensable attribute of State power, an attribute that has a very definite function in the struggle among State capitalist trusts. Capitalist society is unthinkable without wars—the inevitableness of economic conflicts conditions the existence of arms.

This is why in our times, when economic conflicts have reached an unusual degree of intensity, we are witnessing a mad orgy of armaments. ("Imperialism and World Economy." L. Bukharin. Martin Lawrence edition. P. 127.)

These economic conflicts are, in their turn, conditioned by the endeavour of the master classes to gain economic advantage in controlling or annexing commodity markets, trade routes, sources of raw material, and areas of investment.

To expect Disarmament to be accomplished whilst retaining capitalist private property relationships is Utopian in the extreme; the pacifists, however, have no notion of the fact that the above stated capitalist rivalry, and their armed forces are determined by these relations.

How, then, is Disarmament to be achieved? In answering this question we shall begin by pointing out that such an objective is inseparably linked

up with Socialism, and both of these tasks can only be accomplished by the working class.

The first step in this direction is by far the most important and difficult, namely, the converting of working-class opinion to Socialist knowledge.

The result of the spread of Socialist thought is organisation in the Socialist Party. Then, in the manner laid down in our principles, the working class conquers political power. In doing this they disarm the master class of their control of the armed forces.

Twenty-One Years Ago

TWENTY-ONE years ago commenced a war, in which millions of the working class suffered death and mutilation for the greater glory and profit of their capitalist masters. Not that the issue was presented quite so bluntly; the supreme aim, the British working class was told, was to make the recurrence of war forever impossible. And now, twenty-one years after the "War to end War," the phrase, "the next war," is beginning to become a commonplace; world expenditure on armaments has reached astronomical figures, and paternal governments seek to instruct civil populations how best to conduct themselves when subjected to poison-gas attacks.

Although "to end war" was the supreme aim, there were also lesser, subordinate, aims. The "World was to be made safe for Democracy," we were told. It was made so safe that most of the post-war democratic constitutions have already given place to dictatorship in one form or another, and where democratic forms of government still survive, "defence of democracy" continues to provide a basis for solemn pronouncement and flaming appeals.

Twenty-one years ago Prussian militarism was presented as the implacable enemy of civilisation. To-day, for the time being, the friendliest relations exist between our capitalist masters and the Nazi dictatorship in Germany, dictatorship which, in its laudation of militarism, its cynical disregard of, and contempt for, all that civilisation is supposed to represent, would make a Prussian Junker of the old school blush with embarrassment.

We were also assured that the rights of small nations, of racial and national minorities, were to be safeguarded; to-day Jew-baiting is becoming increasingly popular, the persecution of national minorities goes on apace, while Imperialist Japan plunders a stricken China, and Mussolini prepares to "civilise" Abyssinia.

Twenty-one years ago, at the outbreak of the war, either the utmost confusion prevailed among those parties claiming to represent working-class interests, or, as in the case of the British Labour

Party, they openly placed their services at the disposal of the capitalist class. Only the Socialist Party of Great Britain openly proclaimed its firm adherence to the principles of international working class solidarity, and urged the British working class to oppose its own class interests to that of the capitalists by organising together with the workers of all countries for the overthrow of capitalism, here and elsewhere.

As the resistance of the ex-capitalists to the new order becomes weaker so the need to maintain the weapons with which to stamp out this resistance becomes ever more unnecessary.

The coercive forces gradually die out until Disarmament in its entirety is an accomplished fact.

SOUTHEY.

To-day, there is every indication that the same people who deluded the workers then, are prepared to do the same again. The Labour Party talks about the need for defending "collective security," "democracy," and the League of Nations. Bolshevik Russia proclaims the "indivisibility of peace," and hastens to recognise the justification of capitalist armed forces to maintain that peace—providing, of course, that the capitalist Power concerned is well disposed towards Russia.

To-day, just as twenty-one years ago, the Socialist Party asserts that as long as capitalism exists, so does the danger of war, and that the only way to abolish war is to abolish the cause of war—a social system based upon the private ownership of the means of wealth production. To that end the Socialist Party appeals to the workers to organise consciously for the overthrow of capitalism, by winning political power for the establishment of Socialism.

A. H. M.

This Month's Quotation.

The quotation "Discover what will destroy life and you are a great man," is taken from "Zanoni" (Chapter IV) a novel by Lord Lytton.

Sheffield

Sheffield Branch has re-opened propaganda meetings at Barkers' Pool, Sunday evenings at 7.30 p.m.

Trade Union Branches

The Socialist Party of Great Britain is prepared to consider applications from Trade Unions and other organisations for a representative to state the case for Socialism. Travelling expenses only are required.

Answers to Correspondents

A DEFENCE OF REFORMS BY K. KAUTSKY.

A CORRESPONDENT sends us a copy of the New York *New Leader*, dated May 4th, 1935, containing the last of a series of articles by K. Kautsky in which he reaffirms the view that democracy is essential to the Socialist movement. Our correspondent is interested chiefly in certain conclusions drawn by Kautsky regarding "reformist" and "revolutionary" measures. The relevant paragraphs are given below:—

Once it comes into power, all measures undertaken by our Party assume a Socialist tendency. The determining consideration of all social measures and innovations then becomes centred in the question whether or not they contribute to the material and moral well-being of the masses. In evaluating such measures it would be absurd to draw a line of demarcation between "reformist" and "revolutionary" measures, to exclude the first, or to draw a distinction between two kinds of Socialists—to condemn the reformists and to hail the revolutionists. Reformist measures are those compatible with the existing system of production. Revolutionary measures are those designed to promote its abolition.

The extent to which any measures we may undertake are to be regarded as reformist or revolutionary depends at all times upon the historic circumstances. To be sure, it would be ridiculous to remain reformist at all times and on all occasions. But no less ridiculous is it to confine ourselves at all times to revolutionary measures. When we achieve power we shall be called upon to institute both reformist and revolutionary innovations.

REPLY.

Needless to say the S.P.G.B. differs fundamentally from Kautsky on the above-mentioned questions. The point of view expressed well illustrates what it is that divides the Labour and Communist Parties on the one side from Socialists on the other—and this, in spite of the fact that Kautsky's criticisms are addressed primarily to Communists. What Kautsky and the Labour Parties in general fail to appreciate is that basically there is, and can be, only one revolutionary measure for Socialists: that is, the dispossession of the capitalist class of their ownership and control of the means of production and distribution and the transfer of these to society as a whole. That act once accomplished, all the rest of the adjustments necessary after the abolition of capitalism will fall into line. But if that act is not accomplished then there can be no question of Socialism. Kautsky fails to recognise this vital distinction and does not see that the parties he has in mind, the Labour Parties, have no such purpose. Even if some leaders understand what is required the rank and file of such parties do not, but have been recruited on reformist programmes, "those compatible with the existing system of production." Parties of that kind cannot in any circumstances whatever serve as instruments for the entirely different purpose of the one

revolutionary act for the accomplishment of Socialism. If Kautsky cannot see what is the nature and composition of the Labour Parties, that is no doubt because he has long accustomed himself to cultivating illusions about the real strength and growth of the Socialist movement. He is still living in a fool's paradise.

One simple test is provided by Kautsky's statement that "once it comes into power, all measures undertaken by our Party assume a Socialist tendency." Apply this to the British Labour Party, the German Social Democrats, the Austrian and Scandinavian Labour Parties. Is it true that the mostly futile and often dangerous and hostile acts committed by them "assume a Socialist tendency"? It is transparently untrue.

Moreover, we need not wait until they achieve power to measure up their actions. What a party does in power is only a continuation and repetition of what it has been in the habit of doing out of power. The compromising, vote-catching, and essentially non-Socialist activities of the Labour Parties show the fallacy of Kautsky's argument.

Despite the weakness of his argument on this question it must not be forgotten that Kautsky has made valuable contributions to Socialist theory in many directions.

ED. COMM.

• • • • •

J. S., *Toronto*.—We fail to understand the point of your questions. The real question at issue in the correspondence with J. Hawkins was whether or not Marx constantly stressed the need to gain control of the political machinery. None of your quotations from *SOCIALIST STANDARD* and Engels touches on this point. When Engels wrote of the need to suppress any "pro-slavery rebellion," he envisaged doing so in the only way possible, i.e., through control of the political machinery. That is why the S.P.G.B. throughout its existence, has agreed with Marx and Engels that it is absolutely essential for the working class to gain control of the political machinery, including the armed forces.

ED., COMM.

The Socialist Party: its Principles and Policy

Price 2d. (post free 2½d.)

Send your orders to the Literature Secretary, 42, Great Dover Street, London, S.E.1

• • • • •

"SOCIALISM"

48 pages, price 2d. (Post free 2½d.)

Send for a copy to the LITERATURE SECRETARY,
42 Great Dover Street, S.E.1

Outdoor Propaganda Meetings

AUGUST

Sundays:			4th	11th	18th	25th
Finsbury Park	...	6 p.m.	Goldberg	Ross	Godfrey	Lestor
Regents Park	...	11.30 a.m.	Male	Cash	Rubin	Banks
Ridley Road, Dalston	...	8 p.m.	Reginald	Kohn	Walker	Male
Whipps Cross	...	7.30 p.m.	Callis	Walker	Ginsberg	Thompson
Brockwell Park	...	6 p.m.	Wilmot	Lestor	Reginald	Ambridge
Cock Hotel	...	8 p.m.	Lestor	Innes	Ambridge	Rubin
Avenue Road, Lewisham	...	8 p.m.	Manion	Ambridge	Hayden	Ginsberg
Queens Road, Bayswater	...	8 p.m.	Clifford	Reginald	Cash	Innes
Southend Sea Front	...	7 p.m.	Isbitsky	Goldberg	Isbitsky	Walker
Victoria Park	...	5 p.m.	Innes	Goldstein	Ross	Reginald
Clapham Common	...	7 p.m.	Ross	Banks	Ross	Hayden
Saturdays:			Wednesdays:			
London Rd., Wembley (nr. L.M.S. Stn.), High Rd.	7.30 p.m.		Deanery Road, Water Lane, Stratford	...	8 p.m.	
Jolly Butchers Hill	8 p.m.		Highbury Corner, N.5	...	8 p.m.	
Ilford Station	8 p.m.		Hackney Town Hall	...	8 p.m.	
Mondays:			Thursdays:			
Ridley Road, Dalston, E.8	8 p.m.		Ridley Road, Dalston, E.8	...	8 p.m.	
			"Salmon and Ball," Bethnal Green, E.	...	8 p.m.	

BRANCH DIRECTORY

BATTERSEA.—Sec., 2, Hanbury Road, S.W.11. Branch meets Thursday, 8.30 p.m., at The Waiting Room, Latchmere Baths, entrance in Burns Road.

BIRMINGHAM.—Sec., E. Jesper, 38, Rollason Road, Erdington. Branch meets Jeans Café, Newton Street. First Wednesday in month at 8 p.m.

BLOOMSBURY.—Branch meets every Monday at 7.30 p.m., at A.E.U. Hall, 39, Doughty Street, W.C. (Near Grays Inn, Road.) Sec., S.P.G.B., 39, Doughty Street, W.C.1.

CENTRAL.—Membership obtained only through the Ex. Committee. Applications to General Sec.

CHISWICK.—Branch meets Fridays, 8 p.m., over Restaurant, 452 High Road, Chiswick, W.4. Communications to Sec., C. Curtis, 52, Parkstead Road, Putney, S.W.15.

DAGENHAM.—Branch meets alternate Wednesdays, from August 7th, over "Ralphs Cafe," 7 Broadway, Chadwell Heath. Discussion after business. Lectures alternate Wednesdays from August 14th. Communications to Sec. 5, Cannington Road, Dagenham.

ECCELES.—Branch meets 1st and 3rd Mondays in month at Railway Temperance Room, Four Bridges, Wellington Road, 8 p.m. Discussion after Branch business. Non-members invited. Secretary, Mrs. F. Lea, 5, Gaskell Road, Eccles.

EDINBURGH.—Communications to Sec., D. Lamond, at 15, Barclay Place.

GLASGOW.—Branch meets every Tuesday at 7.30 p.m. at McLean Memorial Hall, Salt Market, Glasgow. Communications to T. N. Walshe, c/o Falconer, 100, Naburn Street, C.6.

HACKNEY.—Branch meets Friday, 7.30 p.m., at Old Grave Pit Hall, Vallette Street, E.9. Lecture after each meeting. Communication to Sec., E. Chalkley, 21, Bridge Street, E.9.

ILFORD.—Branch meets Mondays at 8 p.m. at 142, Richmond Road. Discussion after Branch business. Communications to Sec., at above address.

ISLINGTON.—All communications to F. W., 92, Wellington Road, Holloway, N.7. Branch meets on Fridays at 8 to 10.30 p.m., at Room 4, Co-operative Hall, 129, Seven Sisters Road, N.

LEYTON.—Communications to Sec., Dick Jacobs, 12, Clifford Rd., Walthamstow, E.17. Branch meets Thursday, 8 p.m., at Trades Hall, Grove House, High Road, Leyton.

LEWISHAM.—Branch meets Thursdays, at 8 p.m., at The Anchor Club Room, Lewisham Road. Sec. N. Taylor, 5, Hawke Road, Upper Norwood, S.E.19.

MANCHESTER.—Branch meets 2nd and 4th Mondays each month, at 8 p.m., at Craigwell Restaurant, Peter Street (entrance in South Street). Public invited. Sec., B. A. Lee, 19, Emery Avenue, Chorlton, Manchester.

PADDINGTON.—Branch meeting held on 2nd Friday each month, at 8 p.m., in the guild room over "Co-op. Stores," 447, Harrow Road, W.10. Literature Sec., W. Veal, 73, Wornington Road, W.10. Discussion on 4th Friday.

ROMFORD.—Branch meets alternate Wednesdays at 8 p.m., at Ralph's Tea Rooms, High Road, Chadwell Heath. Open to public. Business followed by Lecture and discussion. Secy. P. Golding, "Basra," Boscombe Ave., Hornchurch.

SHEFFIELD.—Sec., G. H. Southey, 112, Pickering Road, Sheffield, 3. Branch meets alternate Mondays, 7.30 p.m. at Room 2, A.E.U. Institute, Stanley Street. Meeting on 29th July.

SOUTHEAST-ON-SEA.—Branch meets Wednesdays at 8 p.m., at 6, Hermitage Road, Westcliff. Discussion after branch business. Non-members invited. Communications to Sec., at above address.

SOUTHWARK.—Branch meets Fridays at 8 p.m., 42, Great Dover St., S.E.1. Communications to Sec., at above address.

STEPNEY.—Sec., H. Solley, 28, Gore Road, Victoria Park, E.9. Branch meets on Fridays, at 8 p.m., at Working Lads Institute (nr. Whitechapel Station).

TOOTING.—Branch meets 1st Sunday in the month, at 12 o'clock noon, at "The Springfield Social Club," 590, Garrett Lane, S.W.17. (Opposite Burntwood Lane). Sec., 174, Haydons Road, S. Wimbledon, S.W.19.

TOTTENHAM.—Branch meets 1st and 3rd Fridays in the month, 7, Bruce Grove, Room 2. Discussion after branch business. Public invited. Communications to C. Godfrey, 49, Napier Road, Tottenham, N.17.

WEST HAM.—Sec., P. Hallard, 22, Colegrave Road, Stratford, E. Branch meets Whitehall School, Parliament Place, Forest Gate, every Thursday at 8 p.m.

WEMBLEY.—Communications to H. G. Holt, 28, Charterhouse Avenue, Wembley, Middlesex. Branch meets every Friday at 8 p.m., at Cafe-Restaurant, over 170, High Road, Wembley. Discussion after branch business.

WOOD GREEN.—Communications to Sec. at 44, Boreham Road, Wood Green, N.22. Branch meets 2nd and 4th Wednesday in month at 8.30 p.m., Stirling House, Stuart Crescent.

THE SOCIALIST STANDARD

The Official Organ of **THE SOCIALIST PARTY** of Great Britain.

No. 373. Vol. 31]

London, September, 1935

[Monthly. Twopence

*Workers of
all lands ..
your enemy
is not on ..
foreign ..
battlefields .
but at home.*

The Jews and Racial Purity

IN the past month there has been another orgiastic outbreak of Jew-baiting in Germany; and a Manchester slum child has received front-page publicity for a childish essay maintaining that "England is the best country in the world." Is there any connection between these two facts, the one so brutal, the other so smugly conventional? Decidedly. The members of the National Government have, in their well-bred, take-it-for-granted, true-blue-British way, been comfortably preening themselves on an unchallengeable "racial superiority," just as confidently, and just as unwarrantably, as have their crudely blustering Nazional fellows in Germany.

Superstitions on the subject of race, of racial differences and superiorities, are so rife even to-day that we can well afford to examine the subject.

In its usual everyday acceptance the term "race" is loosely used to equate with "nationality." There is a widespread belief that there are inherent and immutable differences between "races" (meaning nationalities), and

that one's own is vastly preferable to all others. Such beliefs are amply demonstrated in anti-Semitic movements, in the position of negroes in the U.S.A., in the Australian Yellow-Peril phobia, in the "colour problem" generally. The growth and consolidation of the British Empire has particularly fostered these theories in every quarter of the world—always, of course, in favour of the British "race." Shaw speaks ironically of "England's legitimate conquests, given to her by God because of her peculiar fitness to rule over less favoured races for their own good," but there are large numbers of people who hold that view in all seriousness.

Such beliefs are dangerously reactionary. They very conveniently serve to conceal, to justify, or to help intensify the exploitation of one section of the world by another. They represent, however, a slapdash, rule-of-thumb sociology which is by no means founded on fact.

Properly speaking, the word "race" is used for a purely physical, scientific classification of human beings, just as horses or dogs are classified. A race, anthropologically, is "a group of people possessing similar physical characteristics." The primary determining factors are the shape of the head, the height and the colour of the skin, all three being taken into consideration. Mankind is divisible, on these lines, into three races: the fair, the dark, the yellow. Each can be further sub-divided, but for the purpose of this article the sub-divisions of the fair race are all that need be noted; they are Alpine (short, dark, round-headed), Mediterranean (short, dark, long-headed), and Nordic (tall, fair, long-headed). But, in the world to-day, practically no pure races exist.

ON OTHER PAGES

	Page
The Present Condition of Italy ...	195
Notes by the Way ...	198
The Class Struggle ...	200
"Social Credit" in Alberta ...	201
Straws ...	202
"Labour's Way to Control Finance" ...	204
The Green Line Strike	206
Answers to Correspondents ..	206
Notices, &c.	199, 203, 207

Only two remote sections of humanity, the Eskimos and the Pigmies, have any real claim to racial purity, and they are dying out. All the rest of the world is racially thoroughly mixed, and only in occasional, isolated, individual cases is a pure racial type to be found. Race overrides both national and linguistic frontiers; people of similar race speak entirely different languages and live in different countries, and, at the same time, people of divergent race speak the same language and live in the same country.

Many so-called races are nothing of the kind; for example, "Celtic," "Latin," and "Aryan" are all language divisions and by no means racial. Latin (or Romance) languages are spoken by people who differ widely from each other racially—Bretons and Roumanians, Spaniards and Walloons, for example. As for Aryan, not only is it *not* a racial division, but even as a language division it is no more than an assumption. There is a large group of languages called "Indo-Aryan," but the root derivation of them all has never been discovered. Hitler uses the word Aryan to describe a type which would correctly be called "Nordic"—but we may note that a very small minority of those speaking Aryan languages are of Nordic stock. Most Germans, for example, are of alpine type. So are the Jews, who are a religious and *not* a racial group. They are no more a race than are the Christians. Racially they are very mixed, but predominantly Alpine and Mediterranean, though with a fair admixture of Nordic stock. Only about thirty per cent. of the Jews have the so-called "Jewish nose"—which is actually a characteristic of the East Alpine group, irrespective of religion. From an anthropological point of view the Hitler doctrines and policy are comic to the point of absurdity; logically, to exclude all but the Nordics, he would have to dispense with some two-thirds of the population of Germany—while if he countenanced the Alpine stocks of which most Germans come, he would have to include most of the Jews, too. He is not, however, concerned with logic: an anti-Jew campaign helps to lessen the unemployment problem of non-Jews and distracts attention from other social problems; and foggy ideas about race foster the prejudices which encourage his campaigns.

The theory of inherent differences of temperament or outlook between racial groups is entirely baseless. It springs not from fact but from national prejudice. The only innate differences between races are the purely external physical ones of skin-colour, height and shape of head. These superficial distinctions have no influence whatever either upon temperament or intelligence. Intelligence is determined by quickness of sense perceptions, especially sight and hearing; it is conditioned—warped or encouraged—according to social environment. "Intelligence tests carried

out in Australia and South Africa have shown that black children are not inferior in intelligence to white children. These results have caused some surprise, but there is no real reason why they should. Intelligence in children is the result of quick sight and good hearing. Every child born with good eyes and ears is born intelligent, though in most cases it is soon made stupid by disease, dull surroundings and dogmatic teaching. So-called racial differences, so far as our evidence goes, are merely differences in upbringing. Nationalism exists and thrives on the entirely false belief that these artificial, and often indeed non-existent, differences are innate and unalterable." (Lord Raglan, in the *Listener*, October 3rd, 1934.) The social circumstances, the sum total of manifold social influences, are what determine such differences as do exist between people of different nations.

But in class society the paramount social factor, overriding and often obliterating all others, is class. Class distinctions are stronger and more apparent than national or racial ones. There is an infinitely greater resemblance between two workers of different race, than between a worker and a capitalist of the same race. Except for the language barrier, a white miner and a yellow one would find far more in common with each other than either would with a mineowner of his own colour. It is easier to mistake a Pole for an Englishman or a Dane for a Frenchman, than to mistake Mr. Selfridge for a navvy or an archbishop for a 'bus conductor.

What are the uses of this race superstition? It both springs from and foments social prejudice: it assists political domination, that is, economic exploitation, as in India and Africa; it assists capitalist sections by encouraging jingoism and war-mongering, as in Abyssinia; above all, it is invaluable in obscuring the class issue: by setting up barriers of superstition and prejudice among them, it prevents the workers all over the world from realising their common cause. Actually, the world is divided into two opposing classes, buyers and sellers of labour power, whose interests cannot be reconciled under capitalism. But the race superstition makes it appear that there are numbers of "races" (corresponding with political divisions) whose characteristics and whose interests are fundamentally and inherently at variance. That is mere nonsense; but the capitalists would rather the workers' heads were filled with such nonsense than with sense about the class struggle and how to end it. This particular nonsense is a useful spur to patriotism when national sections of the capitalist class come into conflict, and want the workers to do the fighting for them.

There is only one way to end all this confusion of thought, this muddle of prejudices: remove the ignorance on which the exploiters trade.

Do not allow the real nature of present-day society to be shrouded in these webs of misconception and falsification. By clearing away such fancies we lay bare the class issue which is the crux of the world problem. The workers must understand, plainly and unequivocally, that society to-day stands on a basis, not of nationality or of race, but of private ownership of the means of life; that it is organised not for "progress" or for "enlightenment," but simply and only for profit. The sooner the workers grasp these simple facts and their implications, the sooner will they sweep

away the present organisation of society and all its superstitions, and bring into being a state of things organised to produce not for profit but only for use.

Not until the means of production are collectively owned and controlled by the whole community can class distinctions vanish. Not until then will the idea of race be wholly freed from these false associations that are bound to cling to it in capitalist society, which depends for its very existence on the exploitation of man by man.

STEWART.

The Present Condition of Italy

THIS article, which we publish for the information of readers interested in the attitude of Italian workers towards their rulers, is taken from the *Indian Labour Journal*, July 28th, where it appeared under the title, "Through Italy." It was supplied by the International Transport Workers' Federation and was written by a former resident in Italy who recently had the opportunity of making a tour of investigation. For reasons of space it has been necessary to shorten the article. While offering it for information, we do not share the writer's point of view on all points.—ED. COM.]

Grotesque as it may sound, Italy is at present a Fascist state in which there are no longer any Fascists. This is the astounding result of the observations I have made during a tour of several weeks through the entire country, a tour which enabled me to come into touch with all classes of the population and to learn what their disposition was. Clear distinctions must be made between appearances and reality. As far as appearances go, the Fascist spirit is still trumps. Fascist uniforms and badges are still being worn, and the Roman salute is given. But I have found that people who are outwardly out-and-out Fascists confess, in confidential chats, to being the most downright anti-Fascists. That this is not due to a concatenation of coincidences but represents the general situation is shown by a saying now current in Italy, which runs as follows:

Three Italians together—three Fascists; two Italians together—two friends; one Italian alone—one anti-Fascist!

The estrangement from Fascism is equally marked in all classes of the population. Workers are anti-Fascists, the farmers are anti-Fascists, the middle-class people are anti-Fascists, the capitalists are anti-Fascists. Some are so because, besides taking away their liberty, Fascism has also robbed them of their scanty livings, others because they tremble to observe that Fascism is steering more and more towards an economic disaster. Those basing their judgment on appearances alone and not getting

into closer touch with the people, will have no inkling of such a disposition of the people in Italy. Again and again tourists in Italy have recounted to me in the most enthusiastic terms the great and far-reaching changes that have taken place under Mussolini. Fascism, according to them, has extracted Italy from its former position of backwardness, and raised it within hardly thirteen years to the level of the big European industrial states. In proof of this they point to the up-to-date arterial roads met with all over the country, one of which actually leads up Mount Etna to a height of 2,000 metres; to the work of modernisation, the signs of which are to be seen in any of the larger towns; to the progress of traffic facilities, etc., etc.; not forgetting, of course, the construction of new towns like Littoria and Sabauda, which announce their existence to the tourist from afar, being bathed in seas of light such as are elsewhere only to be met with in a metropolis.

Those are all incontrovertible facts. Those visiting Italy to-day, and remembering the state of the country ten or twenty years back, got the impression that a fresh state on a gigantic scale has been made in the direction of progress. But this impression rapidly fades on deviating even a few kilometres from the main roads of the tourist traffic in Italy. There the order of the day is not construction but dilapidation. The houses and alleys are dirtier than ever before. Nowhere is a new building, or even so much as a scaffolding, to be seen. The people are badly dressed and badly nourished. The tourist witnesses a scene of indescribable squalor. In Messina, for example, slums dating from the time of the earthquake are to be seen, generating pestilential smells. Usually—at least in the south—electric light extends no farther than a few kilometres from the towns, and even the railway stations have to carry on with oil lamps for illumination. In many cases drinking water has to be conveyed in big tank trains to places where there are no springs, not to mention water mains. Sicily, once the granary of Rome,

is even now still withered and dried up in summer over two-thirds of its area, because Fascism, too, has failed to provide the necessary irrigation works, the construction of luxurious, and consequently uneconomic, arterial roads evidently seeming to Fascism to be of greater moment and thus more urgent.

It will be readily understood that the Italian country people are not exactly rapturous about the arterial roads. They are shrewd enough to know not only that they only swallow up the money needed for the construction of irrigation works and the better maintenance of their own roads, but also that their own increasing poverty is somehow connected with the luxury constructions of Mussolini. The country people, they say, must fare worse, so that the townspeople may fare all the more luxuriously.

Campaign against Abyssinia

What distinguishes Italy nowadays very markedly from what it was in former times is the dominance of the uniform in street scenes. Many towns give the tourist at once the impression of just having wandered into a big barrack. It is as if the entire Italian nation had exchanged the mandoline for the rifle and as if Mussolini cherished ambitions—besides those of being a maker of roads and builder of cities—to make Italy the Prussia of the Mediterranean.

In the south, uniforms are much more plentiful than in the north. Anyone travelling from Messina to Milan might get the idea that he was travelling through two different countries, one at war, the other at peace. Militia especially are rarely to be seen in the streets of northern towns. In Milan I could go about for hours in the busiest parts of the town without coming across a single militia uniform. Fascist badges are also less plentiful in the north, while the Roman salute is conspicuous only by its absence.

These distinctions are not confined to appearances, either. The people of the north have not managed to get up any real enthusiasm for Fascism. They consider it as a fruit of the south and, above all, a costly one.

That antipathy to Fascism is stronger and less covert in the north, could be inferred from the shortlivedness of the Fascist placards. Stuck up overnight they were torn up by the next day, in the hub of the town as well as on the outskirts. I was told that this has been quite a common occurrence for a long time past. Typical Fascist papers, too, are read in the north to a much less degree than in the south. Mussolini's *Popolo d'Italia*, which is published at Milan, was indeed vociferously hawked about the streets, but hardly any were being sold.

Is this land of uniforms also indeed a militarised land? This question interested me keenly. During a long stay in the country previously I

had come to regard the Italians as a peace-loving people, to whom militarism and war were abhorrent. It was just when more than two decades back I stood for the first time in the square fronting the cathedral of Milan, that I found myself surrounded by crowds of people taking part in a mass demonstration against the Lybian war. Had Mussolini succeeded in so completely reversing the character of a nation as to cause it now to greet a similar enterprise with jubilation?

In order to satisfy myself on this point I have taken great pains, making observations throughout the country as to how the nation is reacting to the Abyssinian conflict. And I have discovered no trace of any such enthusiasm as the Italian newspapers would like to make out as existing, for the sake of opinion abroad and even at home. The attitude of the people is one of earnest reticence, and in intimate chats I was able to elicit surprising opinions, lending a somewhat sinister aspect to the present state of affairs in Italy. A former Communist, now to all appearances a strict Fascist, explained to me that Mussolini's assault on Abyssinia was the most palpable proof that he was at the end of his resources. It had not been forgotten in Italy, he said, that former regimes had always begun an African campaign when they got into difficulties; and Mussolini was pursuing the same method. He should not be restrained, however, in this enterprise, but rather urged on. On the rock-bound plains of Abyssinia grew no laurels for him to pluck. He would merely be running his head against that rocky wall as so many others had done before him, not least the Italians.

In uttering these sentiments the Communist was only voicing the thoughts of many an Italian as to Mussolini's Abyssinian venture. Similar expectations were expressed by the Italians in most of the conversations I had with them, and simple workers more than once remarked: "We need the guns to put an end to the famine." And when, with feigned astonishment, I inquired whether by "famine" they really meant Fascism, the answer was in the affirmative every time.

A Hunger-Stricken Land

It made a great impression on me that the workers had hardly let themselves be infected by Fascism at all. Of one accord, north and south, they reject it; and this observation of mine has frequently been confirmed by remarks I have heard in bourgeois circles. This contrasts markedly with Hitler's national socialism which, by means of the so-called "Battle of Labour," has succeeded in sweeping a considerable portion of the workers off their feet.

I seek the explanation in the fact Mussolini had no such hard and unfortunately effective predecessors in wage-cutting as Hitler had later in Brüning and Von Papen. He had to make the

cuts himself and consequently to unmask himself before the workers from the very outset. Besides this, the severe unemployment prevailing in Italy to-day first came into the country under Fascism, so that Mussolini was not able, either, to lay the blame for it on to his predecessors in the Government; nor could he make "Marxism" the scapegoat, for its organisations had never obtained representation in the Government. The relief work provided by Mussolini in the shape of the construction of arterial roads, harbour works, public buildings, etc., did not succeed in making the desired impression on the Italian workers, who, in contrast to the Germans, are not satisfied merely with working, but want to make a living by it, too. And Fascism has failed to enable them to do so. The thirteen years of Mussolini's dictatorship have proved to the workers to be thirteen years of continual robbery of their wages and thus of their subsistence.

The most deplorable conditions in this respect I have come across in the south. Here the average daily wages amount to a mere seven lire, equivalent to about 2s. 4d. Only in quite exceptional cases is this level exceeded in the south. A wage of twelve lire is regarded there as quite a big income. In Central Italy and, above all, in the north, the level is, generally speaking, higher, and would be, for the broad masses in the region of 18 lire. Skilled tradesmen may occasionally be found earning more, in exceptional cases perhaps as much as 30 lire, but this is exceptional indeed. The elite of the manual and brain workers is considered to be the civil servants, whose monthly incomes vary for the most part from 400 to 700 lire. All the figures given represent gross earnings which, in practice, suffer considerable reductions in the shape of compulsory contributions to Fascist organisations, etc.

But it should by no means be inferred that this low level of wages carries with it a correspondingly low level of prices. Italy is rather to be classed among the dear countries than among the cheap ones.

Another rock menacing Mussolini is his increasing isolation in the midst of the Italian people. It has already led to a fundamental alteration in the character of the Fascist dictatorship. Able, formerly, to rely on the support of certain sections of the bourgeoisie, it has now no other backing than that provided by the Fascist militia. For the alienation of the bourgeoisie from Fascism has been accompanied by an increasing loss of hold on the regular forces, the officers of which practically reflect the opinions and ideas in vogue among the bourgeoisie. The higher officers' circles were never particularly attached to Fascism. The generals had compounded with it because they were in need of its services, and because they had their orders from the King. Now the old dis-

crepancies have cropped up again, and on the part of the officers, at any rate, little effort is made to conceal them from the public. Yet Mussolini need have no immediate fears on this score. A military dictatorship would be compromised in Italy to-day just as much as the present dictatorship of the militia is, and at all events the fall of Mussolini would, to the masses of the workers, be the signal for a storm such as no military sabres could hope to arrest. This is indeed the sole reason why the bourgeoisie find it expedient to fold their hands and let things take their natural course. Fearing the consequences of Mussolini's policy as they do, they fear even more the unknown things that may lurk behind Fascism to emerge when it has fallen.

Nor need Mussolini fear as yet the hostility of the agricultural and industrial workers. Their limbs are paralysed by the terror of dictatorship, and they lack, too, the organisational connections and political conceptions needful to enable them to carry out a really menacing movement against the dictatorial system.

More important to my mind at present, therefore, appears the rock which may loom up in Mussolini's path in the shape of his own militia. It is no uncommon thing for the good understanding between dictators and their militia to be of short duration. We have a bloody case in point in the events of June 30th, 1934. Such St. Bartholomew's Eves among friends Mussolini has not been obliged to exhibit to the world, only because, being a better student of history than Hitler, he had thoroughly purged his militia long before the fabled "March on Rome," and thenceforward subjected it to continual siftings. Only just during the last few weeks he seems to have resumed his activities in this direction, for the dispatchment of strong contingents of militia to Africa is generally attributed to difficulties that Mussolini has experienced out of the ranks of his own troops. Everything points to the fact that this time he is carrying out the most drastic purge that ever the Fascist militia in Italy have experienced. But cauterise the existing sores as he may, the virus, uneliminated, is sure to break out again in fresh places, and the more evident the isolation of his dictatorship becomes to the public, the more and the worse these sores will grow.

I have not been in sufficiently close touch with the internal affairs of the Fascist militia to be able to determine with any degree of exactitude the extent and the reasons of the conflicts that have arisen within its ranks. But the looming shapes of these rocks are becoming more and more clearly outlined. Will Mussolini be able to steer clear of these, too? Just now it rather seems as if he will run straight on to them at headlong speed, if he does not run up against the financial or the Abyssinian rocks first.

Notes by the Way

Tea Party

The gossip writer of the *Evening News* is to be thanked for telling us that at a banquet given at the Savoy in 1924 in honour of Don Augustus Edwards, Chilean Ambassador, there were present 200 guests, of whom "more than 100 were millionaires, and 20 others were millionaires four times over."

The *Evening News* and other Rothermere newspapers are always complaining that high taxes and high wages are ruining the poor capitalists. Yet here is one dining-table representing £200 millions or more.

Dope for African Slaves and Wage-Slaves

The Abyssinian ruling class may be weak in modern weapons of destruction but they know how to serve up mental dope for their own oppressed classes. The Archbishop of Abyssinia might be the Archbishop of Canterbury himself when it comes to coining seductive phrases for egging on other people to sacrifice their lives. Listen to this, from a report of a sermon at Addis Ababa on Sunday, August 18th (see *News-Chronicle*, August 19th):—

The Archbishop . . . urged the nation to pray for peace, but to prepare for war.

God had protected Ethiopia throughout past ages, he declared. God's aid would yet sustain them if they were brave and united, if they would forget all class and tribal differences.

Note particularly the appeal to the "have-nots" to "forget all class and tribal differences"; in order, of course, that the "haves" shall be well protected.

World Production and Human Needs

Many non-Socialist critics of things as they are have jumped to the conclusion that because destruction of products and restriction of output are carried out by capitalists and governments, that there is in existence more than enough of everything to satisfy the real needs of the human race. This is a fallacy. Destruction and restriction take place because capitalism is run for profit. The capitalist is not concerned with human needs as such, but only with the capacity to pay a price which will yield him a profit. Therefore, wherever capitalism exists, and from its earliest stages, production can be restricted and goods destroyed in spite of the fact that there are insufficient goods to satisfy the needs of those who lack the necessary money to buy.

The League of Nations (see *The Times* report, July 27th) has recently published a work called "Nutrition and Public Health," by E. Burnet and W. R. Ackroyd. According to *The Times* summary of the work, no country in the world can

claim that the whole of its population is satisfactorily fed. "Poverty and ignorance, but mainly poverty, are to blame. . . . The so-called 'protective' foods, richest in minerals and vitamins—milk, green vegetables, fresh fruit, eggs—are . . . in all countries beyond the means of great masses of the population."

In Great Britain, between 10 per cent and 25 per cent. of the population "cannot afford a diet of the type and quality now known to be essential as a safeguard against malnutrition and disease."

Regarding world-output of foodstuffs it is shown that, in relation to human needs, there is no over-production in the world as a whole.

"Even in the United States there is not enough land under cultivation at present to supply the whole population with a liberal diet. While a world wheat surplus threatens economic stability, pellagra and beri-beri, both diseases which the consumption of wheat would eliminate, continue to take thousands of lives every year."

The Marxian case against capitalism, that it is a fetter on production, is as true as ever it was. Capitalism alone stands in the way of using the world's resources to the full for the satisfaction of human needs.

Warlike Sir Walter

A short while before Sir Walter Citrine received his title he was speaking in Copenhagen at the Conference of the International Federation of Trade Unions. According to a *Daily Herald* report, published on May 24th, he spoke as follows about the British workers and a war against Germany:—

If I read the tone and temper of our Movement in Great Britain aright, the moment the Movement believes that Hitler has no intention of coming into any general scheme for the reduction of armaments and the safeguarding of the peace of the world, then the British Movement will be ready to show that it is not going to be threatened or intimidated by a Hitler or any combination of Hitlers.

It may be said that this speech merely describes the outlook of British workers, and did not express the opinions of the speaker, but we look in vain for any declaration from him warning the workers of all countries against being tricked into supporting war by propaganda against the real and imagined enormities of foreign rulers. In 1914 it was "Prussian Militarism," or "Russian Barbarism," or "Serbian Assassins," or "British Imperialism," according to the country in which the particular war-propaganda was being put over. Hasn't Sir Walter Citrine yet learned that wars are waged by capitalist Governments for capitalist objects, and never in order to protect working class interests?

On one point we can correct him. He says that the British workers are "not going to be threat-

ened or intimidated by a Hitler or any combination of Hitlers." He must know full well that if a large-scale war broke out, and the British capitalists needed millions of troops, they would first try persuasion (aided by large numbers of Trade Union leaders, themselves exempt from military service), and would then threaten, intimidate and force unwilling conscripts into the trenches. All in defence of "Liberty"!

A Pretty Story of Capitalist Patriotism

The kind of people who lament the decline of patriotism in the western countries sometimes hold up Japan as an example of what patriotism ought to be and to do, but a story published by the *Manchester Guardian* (August 15th) shows that the capitalist principle of "profit before all" has made headway in Japan. Owing to the Japanese Government's efforts to annex large areas of China, Chinese organisations organised boycotts of Japanese goods, and anti-Japanese propaganda became widespread and popular. Here was a chance to sell matches in boxes bearing the words "Down with Japan," and steps were soon taken to meet the demand. At that moment the Japanese Government demanded, and the Chinese authorities agreed, that all such anti-Japanese propaganda should cease. The firm manufacturing the matches thereupon went bankrupt—a Japanese firm, making the matches in Japan for export to China!

What a Backward Nation thinks of Civilisation

Because the contacts of whites with blacks have mostly been those of an exploiting class seeking to make profit out of defenceless natives, the attitude of the latter is usually one of fear and hatred. According to the late L. M. Nesbitt (*Evening Standard*, July 10th) the Abyssinians have a saying: "We fear the British; we hate the Italians; we loathe the French."

Leaders who will Lead from Behind and Below

The Italian Fascists and German Nazis make their special appeal in the name of the principle of Leadership, but, like many other leaders we have heard of, they do not propose to carry the thing to such extreme lengths as to endanger their own precious skins. So we have the Italian poet, D'Annunzio, urging on Italian soldiers to receive "the ardour and clangour of the African wind in your beautiful Latin faces," but regretting that he is too old to take part in the campaign himself (*Evening Standard*, July 10th). He is indeed 71 years of age, but a man is never too old to stop a bullet, or to receive an African wind (except that his Latin face is no longer beautiful—if ever it was), and he did fight in the Great War. But he describes himself as belonging to the "Adowa

generation," and it is to wipe out the "atrocious and shameful mark" of that defeat that he now lusts for war. At the time of Adowa he was about 30 years of age, and one wonders why this fighting-cock was not there.

From Italy to Germany is but a short step in the realms of ideas, and we learn (*Evening Standard*, August 20th) that the Nazi leaders are having an elaborate bomb-proof shelter constructed in Berlin for the use of the Cabinet. Should occasion arise, doubtless the great and lesser leaders will emerge after each air raid and congratulate the Berliners who were not in bomb-proof shelters on their wonderful heroism.

How to Get Power

Until the electorate has advanced to the stage of knowing exactly what it wants and how to get it there will always be room for the vote-catcher who promises to each group of his constituents whatever it is they want, irrespective of ways and means of fulfilling the promise. Hitler is a case in point. He promised work for the workless, higher wages for the workers, protection for small traders and manufacturers, bigger profits for large-scale concerns, and prosperity for everyone—except Jews, Communists, Liberals, Social-Democrats, etc., and most of those were promised a better time if they would repent. Now Huey Long, the American, who hopes to be another Hitler, has gone one better. In a speech to reporters in New York on August 15th (reported in the *Daily Telegraph*, August 16th) he promised two things simultaneously, although the one is plainly incompatible with the other. His main pledge is to share the wealth of the rich with the poor, but he impudently promised at the same time "to make more millionaires than had ever existed before in the United States." It is true that electors have been induced to believe the most extraordinary things, but having taxed their powers of belief to that extent it is hard to see why Long did not take the final step and promise to make all Americans millionaires. H.

BLOOMSBURY.

Lectures will be given on Monday evenings at A.E.U. Hall, 39, Doughty Street (Corner of Guildford Street), W.C.1. at 8.30 p.m.

Sept. 2	-	-	Open Discussion—"The United Front"
" 9	-	-	"Music and Money"
			M. BARITZ
" 19	-	-	"Development of Social Theory"

Admission free. All invited. Questions and Discussion.

A RAMBLE to CATERHAM

will take place
on Sunday, September 15th
Meet at FINDLATERS CORNER (London Bridge), at 10 o'clock
Return fare, 1/9 SOCIAL COMMITTEE

THE SOCIALIST STANDARD

SEPTEMBER,



1935

OFFICIAL NOTICE

All communications for the Executive Committee. Subscriptions for the SOCIALIST STANDARD, Articles, and Correspondence submitted for insertion therein, should be addressed—The Socialist Party of Great Britain, 42, Great Dover Street, London, S.E.1, to whom Money Orders should be made payable.

The meetings of the Executive Committee are held at the Head Office, every Tuesday, at 7.30 p.m.

TERMS OF SUBSCRIPTIONS.

Twelve Months, post free	2s. 6d.
Six Months, post free	1s. 3d.

The Class Struggle

A Timely Reminder

THERE are so many people who do not understand what is the nature of the class-struggle of which Socialists speak, and so many others who choose to misrepresent it, that the essential facts cannot be repeated too often. The class-struggle is something which exists owing to capitalism. It is not an idea invented by Socialists. It existed before there was any Socialist Movement. The existing class-struggle is a fact arising from the division of human beings into two social classes. They are not divided into classes by Socialists, or by their own ideas and outlook, but by their possession or non-possession of property. The capitalist class are those who own sufficient property to be able to live on the income which flows to them through their ownership. They are the receivers of rent, interest or profit. The working class are those who, because they do not own sufficient property to be able to live on property income, must work for their living. They must sell their physical and mental energies, their labour-power, to the capitalist class and the agents of the capitalist class. In return, they receive wages or salary. The working class includes those who perform practically all of the work necessary for the production and distribution of wealth, from the making of bricks to the task of organising and directing. They are all workers, working to order, producing wealth for the capitalists to own. These are facts, and it is remarkable how rarely the defenders of capitalism even attempt to dispute them. Given this private ownership of the world's means of producing and distributing wealth, a class struggle is the necessary conse-

quence, expressing itself as a struggle by the propertyless to gain control of property, or as a struggle over the division of the product of industry—strikes, lockouts, etc.

The part played by Socialists is not that they have created this struggle, but that they point it out, explain it, and show how it can be abolished by the abolition of classes.

The part played by some of the defenders of capitalism is to pretend that the struggle has no basis in material conditions but exists only because certain people hold and preach views regarding it. Thus *The Times*, in an editorial, on August 21st, takes the Trades Union Congress to task for not rejecting the class-struggle theories it is supposed to hold. The T.U.C. is invited to observe that employers, far from seeking to reduce wages during the crisis, "have had for their object that maintenance of the general standard of living which has also been . . . the anxious concern of the Unions," and to observe further that in the newer industrial areas, where workers are employed "in agreeable surroundings" and have "welfare amenities," the "conflict of interests between employers and workpeople . . . has scarcely arisen."

The phrasing of this betrays at once that *The Times* writer does not understand what conflict of interests means. It is not something which may or may not arise, but something which exists in the nature of capitalism. To him, the absence of trade union organisation in some of the newer industrial areas, particularly round London, shows that there is no conflict of interest. It shows nothing of the kind. The absence of trade union organisation may be due to the employers being able to forbid trade union membership, or to the fact that the workers are not yet aware of the value of organisation. Conflict of interest does not have to show itself in one form only, that of trade unions and strikes. Each individual worker when he weighs up the amount of pay offered to him, and his chance of standing out for more in face of the competition of the unemployed is taking part in the struggle, and is more or less clearly conscious of the conflict of interest between him and his employer. The very relationship of employer giving orders and employee having to take orders is a distinguishing mark of the class-struggle. Again, if *The Times* writer were familiar with one of the most outstanding examples of modern capitalist organisations in which trade unions are as far as possible prohibited—Ford's—he would recall that only two or three years ago a savage conflict occurred at the Detroit works in which lives were lost and many workers and police were injured. Moreover, in 1933, there were strikes at Ford's Dagenham Works, and at those of his subsidiary, Brigg's Bodies. During August of this year a wages dispute occurred at Ford's

Dagenham works and led to the defeat and dismissal of strikers.

The Times writer betrays himself again when he admits that "the conflict of interests between employer and workpeople" has in the past been the "*raison d'être* of the Unions." He mentions a certain gilding of the chains of wage-slavery in the form of "welfare amenities," but apart from this he nowhere shows that the conditions in the newer industries are more than superficially different from those in the older ones. And again, how, on his supposition, does he account for the persistence of the unions and their 100,000 increase of membership in the past 12 months?

Before leaving this topic we would like to refer *The Times* writer to an earlier editorial which appeared on June 22nd of this year. In it we are given some interesting facts about the ownership of wealth in America. First, a quotation from a speech by President Roosevelt, in which the President declared that for three generations there had been "a constantly increasing concentration of wealth and power in fewer hands," and secondly, a statement by Mr. Ickes, United States Secretary of the Interior, to the effect that 80 per cent. of the wealth of the country had accumulated in the hands of 2 per cent. of the population. Let us put a question to *The Times* editor. He denies that class-struggle and class-conflict have any necessary existence outside propaganda. Knowing that wealth in America (and also in England) is concentrated in the hands

of a tiny minority of the population, will he deny the existence of a propertied class and propertyless class, and will he affirm that conflict of interests need not exist between those who own the means of life of the whole of society and those who do not own?

THE SOCIALIST PARTY OF GREAT BRITAIN

OBJECT.—The establishment of a system of society based upon the common ownership and democratic control of the means and instruments for producing and distributing wealth by and in the interest of the whole community.

DECLARATION OF PRINCIPLES

THE SOCIALIST PARTY of Great Britain HOLDS—

1. That society as at present constituted is based upon the ownership of the means of living (i.e., land, factories, railways, etc.) by the capitalist or master class, and the consequent enslavement of the working class, by whose labour alone wealth is produced.

2. That in society, therefore, there is an antagonism of interests, manifesting itself as a class struggle, between those who possess but do not produce, and those who produce but do not possess.

3. That this antagonism can be abolished only by the emancipation of the working class from the domination of the master class, by the conversion into the common property of society of the means of production and distribution, and their democratic control by the whole people.

4. That as in the order of social evolution the working class is the last class to achieve its freedom, the emancipation of the working class will involve the emancipation of all mankind without distinction of race or sex.

5. That this emancipation must be the work of the working class itself.

6. That as the machinery of government, including the armed forces of the nation, exists only to conserve the monopoly by the capitalist class of the wealth taken from the workers, the working class must organise consciously and politically for the conquest of the powers of government, national and local, in order that this machinery, including these forces, may be converted from an instrument of oppression into the agent of emancipation and the overthrow of privilege, aristocratic and plutocratic.

7. That as all political parties are but the expression of class interests, and as the interest of the working class is diametrically opposed to the interests of all sections of the master class, the party seeking working-class emancipation must be hostile to every other party.

8. THE SOCIALIST PARTY of Great Britain, therefore, enters the field of political action determined to wage war against all other political parties, whether alleged labour or avowedly capitalist, and calls upon the members of the working class of this country to muster under its banner to the end that a speedy termination may be wrought to the system which deprives them of the fruits of their labour, and that poverty may give place to comfort, privilege to equality, and slavery to freedom.

Those agreeing with the above principles and desiring enrolment in the Party should apply for membership form to secretary of nearest branch or at Head Office.

"Social Credit" in Alberta

THE result of the election in the Canadian province of Alberta is that the "Social Credit" Party, led by Mr. W. Aberhart, has had a sweeping victory, and he will take over the premiership. He proclaims himself a believer in the theories of Major Douglas—but with important modifications. Both he and Major Douglas assert that there is a permanent deficiency of purchasing power under the normal conditions of modern industry, and that this deficiency should be made up by the issue of a "national dividend" to the whole adult population. On the face of it, Mr. Aberhart's proposal to distribute a dividend of £5 a month to every adult is essentially the same as the scheme put forward by Major Douglas, except that the latter offers a much larger dividend. Many newspapers commenting on the Alberta situation have assumed that the two schemes are the same, and many Douglasites are expressing unqualified approval of Mr. Aberhart. Actually, however, it appears to be more than doubtful whether Mr. Aberhart's present intention will

involve trying out the Douglas scheme. The essence of the latter is that the distribution of "national dividend" must be a real addition to existing incomes whereas it is reported that Mr. Aberhart proposes to meet the cost by a 10 per cent. levy on the trade of shopkeepers. If he does this, then his scheme will not differ materially from the familiar Labour Party doctrine of trying to transfer purchasing power from one body of people to another body, by means of taxation.

If Mr. Aberhart aims at something more than this he will be faced at once with the difficulty that the Government of Alberta possesses strictly limited powers under the Canadian Constitution, and in particular that it does not control the issue of currency. He may, therefore, be compelled to try to capture the Government of Canada if he wants to apply the Douglas theories. Already there is talk of an alliance between his party and the new "Reconstruction" Party formed by Mr. Stevens with that object.

As far as the Canadian workers are concerned, neither Mr. Aberhart nor Major Douglas has anything to offer. They are both attempting the impossible, trying to make capitalism work successfully. Many countries have experimented with the financing of schemes of social reform by means of taxation, only to find that the contradictions of capitalism remain. Unemployment and trade depression continue, and the worker still finds himself condemned to poverty because he has nothing to sell except his labour-power. The grant of social services reflects itself in lowered wages. As for Major Douglas's scheme, it cannot be too often repeated that its basis, the supposed deficiency of purchasing power, is an illusion; and the scheme itself would mean in practice inflation of the cur-

rency, with the consequences other countries have seen when a Government tries to pay its way by using the printing press to print more and more inconvertible notes.

What exactly the outcome of the Alberta experiment will be depends, therefore, on what Mr. Aberhart tries to do with his opportunity and on his success in winning all Canada, but in general terms the outcome is absolutely certain beyond any shadow of doubt. Capitalism will continue to produce its normal evils whatever the efforts made to tinker with the currency system.

Nevertheless, the victory of the "Social Credit" Party is interesting, and even has certain pleasing features. It shows that the electors are tired of the game of entrusting their welfare first to a party of capitalist Liberals and then to a party of capitalist Conservatives. This time they have given expression to their unmeasured discontent by rejecting both.

It is also pleasing that the electors in Alberta should have demonstrated their disgust with the politicians and experts who solemnly proclaim that the best, if not the only way of treating the problem of widespread poverty is to curtail production, and to hold goods off the market in order to raise or keep up prices. In this respect the Alberta elections and the interest shown in the Douglas theories all over the world are signs of a welcome development, a growing realisation that poverty is indefensible alongside our existing and potential powers of production. That is a welcome sign, but allied with a lack of knowledge of the nature of capitalism it may lead to bitter disappointments for the working class such as that which awaits them in Alberta.

H.

Straws

Drifting Whither?

Maxton's deterioration goes on apace. For sheer sloppiness, the following (part of speech at recent I.L.P. Summer School, reported in *New Leader*, August 9th, 1935) would be hard to beat: "Those who best lead the people are those who most humbly watch the people, try to understand them, get . . . into the real hearts of the people."

Vote-Catchers' Reward

He attributed the "tremendous success" of the I.L.P. to the fact that "it has never tried to set itself above the people." "Tremendous success" in angling for votes from a politically inexperienced working class has not prevented the Party which claimed to "overwhelmingly" dominate the Labour Government of 1924 (see our "Questions

of the Day," page 36) from dwindling to an insignificant reformist rump of three M.P.s.

Socialism and Religion

Middleton Murry, high priest of the I.L.P. breakaway ("Independent Socialist Party") shows his knowledge of Socialism by endorsing the opinion that "Long ago Socialists claimed that Socialism was a religion, a spiritual experience" (*Northern Voice*, October, 1934). Readers are recommended to study our pamphlet "Socialism and Religion."

Labour Party and Teachers

The *London Teacher* reminds its readers (July 12th, 1935) that Mr. Charles Latham, Labour chairman of the L.C.C. Finance Committee, and

Mr. (Sir) Arthur Pugh, one time chairman of the Trade Union Congress, jointly signed a minority report "recommending an adjustment of teachers' salaries in the neighbourhood of 12½ per cent." This they did as members of the famous "May Committee," which led to the formation of the "National Government."

Codlin and Short

The *London Teacher's* moral is: "Join the National Union of Teachers" (and to those in the know, "Let the rival men's association, the National Association of Teachers, where members are pledged not to work under a woman 'head,' alone"). Codlin's the friend, not Short.

Pedagogic Ice Cream

The *Daily Herald*, however (July 4th, 1935), reports: "Teacher turns ice cream vendor," and quotes the vice-chairman of the "Supply Teachers' Association" as stating that men, "some possessing honours degrees," are "almost on the verge of starvation." . . . Said teachers urged to "bring pressure on the Board of Education" to introduce their "untrained" colleagues to the amenities of the ice cream barrow by incontinently firing them.

"Captains and Guides of the Democracy" (Rosebery)

Twenty-seven years ago, a young recruit to the S.P.G.B. wrote (*SOCIALIST STANDARD*, June, 1906): "The declared reason for the existence of the N.U.T. is the furtherance of the interests of the child. Is there not a danger that it may become the happy hunting ground of the eloquent Party-man in a hurry to round his own life into a success?"

G.L.

"Labour will not sanction war in any circumstances" (George Lansbury at meeting in Wales, June 12th, 1935).

Southport Conference

Now perpend: "There might be circumstances under which the Government of Great Britain might have to use its military and naval forces in support of the League in restraining an aggressor nation . . . etc." (Southport Labour Conference, Report, page 244).

Head and Tail

"Four legs and two voices." Take your choice, which is the brute Caliban, and which the foolish Trinculo. Evasiveness produced the "It is necessary to define what is meant by war," which appears also on page 224.

Soviet Testimonial

Lord Passfield (reported *Daily Herald*, August 4th, 1932) says: "Russian working class families . . . are better off than the lowest grade of our population." The erstwhile Mr. Sidney Webb opines that "the country is relatively prosperous." Now we know something definite about "building Socialism." One is reminded of the famous testimonial in "Alice in Wonderland":

"She gave me a good character,
But said I could not swim."

A. REGINALD.

Hamilton Branch

Members and sympathisers in the neighbourhood of Hamilton are invited to assist the Branch in its propaganda. The Branch meets every second and fourth Wednesday at McIntyre's Hall, 151, Lowwaters.

DONATIONS TO NEW PREMISES FUND

M. L., 10s. 0d.; Chiswick Branch, £1; Photos, 10s. 0d.; A. J. F., 1s. 0d.; J. & C. C., 1s. 10d.; I. L., 10s.; A. H., 10s. 0d.; C. A., 4s. 0d.; H. S., 2s. 6d.; G. M., 7s. 0d.; R. M., £1; J. E., £5; Battersea Branch, £2 5s. 6d.; J. H., 1s. 0d.; H. K., 300fcs.; J. C., 3s. 0d.

DONATIONS TO GENERAL FUND

K. P. B., 6d.; H. O., 11d.; F. J. H., £1; G. R. J., 1s. 0d.; R. M., £1 1s.; G. C. G., 3s. 0d.; L. I. B., 5s. 3d.; Central Branch, £2.

EDUCATIONAL CLASSES

Second Year: October, 1935—March, 1936

	History.	Economics.
Oct. 13	Economic Geography: STEWART.	Value: GOLDSTEIN.
20	Pre-Feudal Europe:	Price: GOLDSTEIN.
Nov. 3	France to 1789: FOX.	Money: EVANS.
10	France 1789-1935: STEWART.	Capital: GOLDSTEIN.
17	Germany: KOHN.	Composition of Capital: GOLDBERG.
22	Spain and Portugal: CAMERON.	Surplus Value: GOLDSTEIN.
Jan. 5	The Netherlands: STEWART.	Wages: CALLIS.
12	Italy: HARDY.	Competition: KOHN.
Feb. 2	Russia and Poland: EVANS.	Monopolies and Trusts:
9	Greece and the Balkans: BARITZ.	Banking and Credit: EVANS.
16	England to 1660:	
23	England 1660-1830: HARDY.	
Mar. 1	England 1830-1936: HARDY.	Critics of Marx answered: GOLDBERG.

Sundays at 4 p.m. at Head Office.

"Labour's Way to Control Finance"

John Wilmot, M.P. (119 pp., Methuen & Co., Ltd., 2s. 6d.).

THIS book is one of a series in course of publication under the title "Labour Shows the Way," designed to justify and explain the Labour Party's programme. It is a defect in a series of this kind that it is not made clear whether the authors are expressing merely their own personal views or whether they are acting as official spokesmen.

The book under review deals with finance. The publisher has spared no pains to convince the reader that Mr. John Wilmot, M.P., knows something about the subject, and it is carefully set out on the dust wrapper that he is a "member of the Institute of Bankers and Company Secretary: Gilbert Prizeman in Banking (Gilbert, please!) . . .," presumably because a reading of the book must make any person of ordinary intelligence wonder whether Mr. Wilmot has even an elementary knowledge of financial economics. Is it because Mr. Wilmot makes it quite clear in the body of the book that he, like the *Daily Herald*, is out to protect the investor that the dust cover omits to mention that he is secretary of the Shareholders' Protection Association, Ltd.?

The argument and recommendations of the book are the familiar ones. Mr. Wilmot's case is that the recent world crisis is but one of a series, and has resulted "not because of any scarcity, but because the system of private capitalism (*sic*) . . . has broken down." The cause of this breakdown he finds in an enormous increase in the productivity of labour as a consequence of the development of machinery and large-scale production and the failure to maintain "an adequate supply of money to ensure that production and consumption keep pace with each other." He therefore proposes that there should be no return to the gold standard, since under that standard "the amount of currency in the world must be restricted according to the supply of gold in the world . . . and the supply of gold does not, and cannot, increase sufficiently fast to keep pace with production enterprises in modern conditions." Mr. Wilmot wants a "managed currency," with the currency and credit policy of the country directed to "relating the supply of money to the producing and consuming capacity of the nation by means of an index of the average price of commodities and raw materials." In order to carry out such a policy it will, he says, be necessary to put the Bank of England and the joint stock banks under national control. General lines of banking policy would be determined by a National Banking Corporation in co-operation with the Government. Mr. Wilmot is careful to point out that "it would be the primary responsibility of the National Bank-

ing Corporation to safeguard the interests of its depositors." A National Investment Board would be set up to supervise the raising of new capital for long-term investment, thereby "improving the security of the investor."

Such, in brief outline, is the book.

Nothing for the Workers

The first thing, apart from Mr. Wilmot's ignorance of economics, which strikes the Socialist reader is that the book is not related to working-class problems. There is a lot of mention of "the nation," of "improving the security of the investor" and "safeguarding the savings of depositors," but the word "workers" only occurs once (on page 113) throughout the book, and then in a passage which contains no suggestion that Mr. Wilmot is concerned with the problem which confronts the working class—the problem of capitalism. In fact, Mr. Wilmot nowhere uses the word "capitalism" unless he prefixes it with the other word "private." The suggestion is never put forward that the carrying out of these Labour Party proposals would benefit the workers to the slightest extent. Certainly no proof that such benefit would be forthcoming is to be found in the book. When discussing the question of public control of the Bank of England, Mr. Wilmot supports his case by pointing out that it is "the only important central bank in the world which is completely free from Governmental control," but he entirely fails to notice that, despite this fact, there is no essential difference between the condition of the workers in this country and the condition of the workers in those countries, such as France, U.S.A., Sweden, Italy, Germany, New Zealand, etc., where there is at least some measure of Governmental control of the central bank. Again, in defending one of his main proposals, that of the regulation of prices by reference to an index system, Mr. Wilmot points out that this has been done in Sweden, but he does not show what benefit it has conferred upon the Swedish workers.

The fact is that Mr. Wilmot, like other Labour Party "intellectuals," does not understand the problem of capitalism as it presents itself to the workers. The very first sentence in the book reveals his type of mind. He writes "the tragic events of recent years have made it clear that there is something radically wrong with our existing economic and financial system," as though unemployment and the workers' poverty had not made that abundantly clear from the beginning of capitalism! Not only does he not understand the problem to be solved, but he does not understand what gives rise to that problem. He has just swallowed all the pseudo-economic clichés

made familiar in recent years by shallow thinkers from the Labour Party experts to Sir Oswald Mosley.

"Private capitalism," he says, "has broken down" (page 3), although five lines later on the same page it has not broken down, but "is breaking down, not only in this country, but in America and all over Europe." How long and how often has this parrot-cry been raised and yet capitalism persists. The workers are still propertyless, and the aim of production is still profit.

The claim that what is wrong with the world is a lack of monetary tokens, will not stand examination for one minute. The workers cannot consume the goods they produce, not because there is not enough money to go round, but because they are divorced from the instruments of production and distribution. Increase the money tokens to any extent you like and the fundamental fact that the workers are wage-slaves will remain. Production has increased and declined in the past without any changes in the amount of money. Then the argument that, under the gold standard, productive capacity must remain unused because the output of gold cannot increase at the same rate as the output of goods, is surely sufficiently outworn for it to be abandoned even by the self-appointed economists of the Labour Party. The fact is that gold production has increased with general output. Further, the boom which preceded the world crisis, took place while the world was on the gold standard.

As for the argument that the productivity of labour has been enormously increased, that has been dealt with frequently enough in the recent issues of this paper. When Mr. Wilmot writes, "We have brick-making machines which will make 3,200 bricks in eight hours, whereas it used to take one man the same time to make 450 bricks," and thereby implies that there has been a seven-fold increase in productivity, he simply reveals the emptiness of his own thought. All arguments of this kind entirely ignore the labour involved in the machine, which, in the final analysis, represents labour necessary for the making of bricks. After allowance has been made for this factor, it is found that the overall annual increase of productivity throughout industry is comparatively small.

Myths about the Banks

As was to be expected, when Mr. Wilmot comes to deal with banking and currency, he writes all the usual nonsense about bank deposits being created by the banks. This, again, is a question which has been fully dealt with in these columns.

The present writer remembers attending, some years ago, a lecture at the London School of Economics where Dr. Dalton, Mr. Wilmot's colleague in the Labour Party, was asked whether "banks create deposits." Dr. Dalton snorted at

the foolishness of the question and replied: "I can promise to lend you and nine others a penny each when I've only got a penny in my pocket, provided nine of you don't ask me to keep my promise. Do you think I've created anything?" Mr. Wilmot ought to have a talk with Dr. Dalton. In any event, if he believes that bank deposits are created by the banks, why does he not, when discussing on page 10 the question of bank charges, ridicule the argument of the banks "that they cannot afford to lend on advances at a rate below 5 per cent., however cheaply they borrow," by pointing out that they do not have to borrow to lend, but create the loans out of nothing or, at least, only have to borrow £1 in order to lend £10 so that the cost of borrowing, i.e., obtaining deposits, is negligible in comparison with the amount of the loans? Further, when he writes, "suggestions—completely unfounded—that the national control of the joint stock banks will mean the loss of the depositor's money are already being made," why does he not confound his opponents by pointing out that even if the depositor's deposits are lost the nationally-controlled banks will soon create some more for them?

It would take too long to expose all the errors of understanding and of theory contained in this book. It has, in fact, already received longer treatment than it merits. The flabby-minded may be deluded into believing that financial reforms, and the multiplication of boards, will bring about a new heaven and a new earth. The class-conscious worker will have no such delusions. B. S.

The Passing of another Old Member

Old members of the Party and numerous sympathisers will be sorry to learn that Comrade J. S. Bird, of Southend, passed out on May 26th last.

For about 20 years he was Secretary of the Southend branch, helping to run the pre-war propaganda meetings and keeping the Branch together during difficult times, particularly during the war years. Those who knew his sturdy cheerful figure in those days will be surprised to hear of his early death. Until recent years he regularly attended Party headquarters on behalf of the Branch, fetching THE SOCIALIST STANDARDS and dealing with other matters that are essential but are out of the limelight. A few years ago he had a serious accident that permanently crippled him and compelled him to give up active Party work, although he still did anything he could to help spread the Socialist message.

Comrade Bird was a member the Party can ill afford to lose. He is another one of those we will sadly miss. He was quiet, dependable, and an enthusiastic worker—one of the type that is the backbone of any organisation. We deeply regret his loss, and his relatives have our sincere sympathy. GILMAC.

The Green Line Strike

ON Thursday, July 25th, employees of the London Passenger Transport Board's Green Line coaches at Windsor and Slough agreed to strike in protest against speed-up schedules of duty and against too much discrimination in wages between Green Line conductors and the 'bus conductors on the same routes.

The Transport Board replied that they would have to wait to have the matter considered until September, when the directors of the Board returned from their holidays.

On the following Saturday morning many other garages joined the strike, bringing the number of strikers up to nearly three thousand. The strike was still, however, quite unofficial, and the Transport and General Workers' Union took up a definitely hostile attitude, advising the men to resume work and let their grievances be settled by means of the existing machinery. Later that day the Board announced that if the men had not returned to work by Monday they could consider themselves dismissed. By Monday morning the men were back at work.

A controversy arose, in which Mr. Bevin criticised not only the minority movement for interfering with the running of union matters, but also Herbert Morrison, the Labour Party's ardent advocate of Public Utility Boards such as London Transport. At the time when Mr. Morrison was making his stand in the House of Commons we maintained that the rationalisation of transport in London would by no means improve the position of the transport workers. But Mr. Morrison, turning a blind eye on the class struggle, continued to urge legislation which could—and did—result only in the bringing together of the transport owners in one united force opposed to the transport workers. During the last few weeks a spate of strikes among the 'bus and coach workers against rigid discipline, speeding up and low wages, has amply vindicated our claim that the Public Utility Boards, which the Labour Party holds up to admiration as measures of "Socialism," are no more than tools to intensify and to mask capitalist exploitation.

The attitude of the Union was unheroic; apparently the leaders wish at all costs to avoid trouble; they expressed no sympathy with the workers in their bad conditions, but merely begged them to return to work and "let things be done decently and in order." However necessary discipline may be in a union, and however "illegal" a lightning transport strike may be, an organisation which claims to fight the workers' battles can rightly be expected to manifest sympathy with, and understanding of, such expressions of the class struggle. In the recent strike, however, the Union simply played into the hands of the bosses.

Modern Trade Union leaders show no inclination to emulate the Tolpuddle Martyrs. No doubt Mr. Morrison will offer to the workers at the next election a programme teeming with Public Utility Boards.

D. S.

Answers to Correspondents

SOCIALISTS AND LOCAL GOVERNMENT.

A correspondent writes asking why our Declaration of Principles includes a reference to the machinery of Local Government. He asks:—

Please explain how the local powers of Government can be converted into the agent of emancipation without first having the majority of people Socialists throughout the world. If my view is correct the local powers are superfluous to Socialists under this system. Why do you include them in your principles if they are superfluous to capture or to administer?

Our correspondent's chief difficulty as to our attitude arises only from his having failed to read our Declaration of Principles carefully.

He asks us to explain how the machinery of Local Government "can be converted into the agent of emancipation without first having the majority of people Socialists." As we do not hold that the machinery of Local Government can be the agent of emancipation without first a Socialist majority has gained control of the machinery of Government as a whole, our correspondent's question does not need answering. We might add that there is nothing whatever in the wording of our Declaration of Principles to give rise to our correspondent's assumption.

The position is really quite a simple one. In all capitalist countries greater or less powers and functions are delegated by the central Government to the Local or Provincial Governments. A Socialist majority will take possession—as our Declaration of Principles says—"Of the powers of Government, national and local." To conquer the central Government and leave the agents of capitalism still in control of Local Government, where they could use their position to obstruct the central Government, would be absurd and Socialists, therefore, do not intend to do it.

One incidental point needs a word of explanation. Our correspondent refers to the supposed need of first having a "majority of Socialists throughout the world." We do not commit ourselves to any such supposed need. While Socialism is necessarily international, and a country like England could not introduce Socialism alone and unaided in a capitalist world, we do not hold the view that it would be necessary to wait until there is a Socialist majority in every country in the world.

ED., COMM.

SOCIALISTS AND THE TRADE UNIONS.

A correspondent asks:—

How do you reconcile members of your Party being prepared to take over any jobs connected with the trade unions or the T.U.C., if they are not prepared to administer the rules or laws made for their control by the owning classes?

This question rests on a failure to understand the Socialist view of the workers' position in the capitalist world. If we took the view that the subjection of the workers is merely a matter of choice on their part as individuals, and that it only requires a change of outlook for each individual to emancipate himself from capitalism, our correspondent's question would have a certain amount of justification. In fact, however, we hold no such view. The working class are a subject class, because the capitalist class own and control the means of production and distribution, and can protect their ownership, and enforce their laws, through their control of the machinery of Government, including the armed forces. There can be no emancipation until a Socialist majority first gains control of the machinery of Government, including the armed forces. Until then the workers, in order to live at all, must work for capitalists, take orders from capitalists, obey capitalist laws, etc. This applies, of course, whether the worker is a Socialist or not, and applies to our correspondent, as it does to members of the Socialist Party. In these circumstances the S.P.G.B. does not forbid its members to work for capitalists, or obey capitalist laws, because that is impossible in a capitalist world. Little as we like producing profits for the capitalists, printing the newspapers, driving their cars, etc., being members of the working class and, therefore, having to sell our labour-power, we have no choice. Where the S.P.G.B. does draw the line is in cases where the work is of such a nature that it makes serious difficulties for our speakers. For example, a man who gets his living as a paid speaker for the Conservative Party might privately agree with the S.P.G.B., but obviously if we allowed him to become a member this would confuse members of the working class who heard us insisting on the need for a Socialist Party to be independent of all non-Socialist Parties. Our attitude is that such an individual could help us more by remaining outside our ranks than by becoming a member.

As regards the Trade Unions, we are not certain that we understand our correspondent's question. The S.P.G.B. is not, and never has been, anti-Trade Union. We do not hold that Trade Unions are useless or unnecessary to the workers under capitalism, although we do hold that particular actions and policies are sometimes useless, or even harmful, to the interest of the working class, due to the members' lack of understanding as to the nature of the problem they are up against.

ED. COMM.

"S.S." Volume and Index

It has been decided to extend the present volume of THE SOCIALIST STANDARD until the end of the year. Future volumes will then run from January to December. The index of the current volume will, therefore, not be published until the end of the year.

The Future of Palestine

A letter from Mr. Jacob Sarna, criticising the article on Palestine, has been received too late for reply in this issue. It will be published, with a reply, in the October issue.

An error was made in the second instalment of the article published in the August issue. A quotation from the *Jewish Chronicle* at the foot of the second column on page 180 is described as referring to Poland. Actually it refers to Manchester.

Successful Week-end School

On August 24th and 25th a very successful week-end holiday school was held at Woodlands Holiday Camp at Kingsdown, Kent. Two lectures were given on Saturday evening and Sunday afternoon respectively. The worst weather conditions of the summer kept down the audience at the evening lecture, but that on Sunday afternoon was very well attended, questions and discussion being animated and interesting. Literature was sold at this meeting, which was held on the slopes of one of the hills which surround the camp. An informal sing-song and dance took place after the lecture on Saturday evening, and an enjoyable ramble through the beautiful Kentish country was organised on Sunday morning. Members were agreed that the whole affair was very enjoyable and instructive, and every endeavour will be made to organise further week-end schools in the future.

EDUCATIONAL VISITS

Educational visits are being organised for the 1st and 3rd Saturdays each month.

Sept. 7	-	TATE GALLERY	-	Com. Kersley
		Meet on steps at 3 p.m.		
.. 21	-	HOUSE OF COMMONS	-	Com. Lestor
		Meet outside House at 3 p.m.		

SOCIAL

A Social will take place on September 28th, at 5, Upper Walthamstow Road (near Wood Street Station). Admission 2d. Commencing 7.30 p.m.

"The Socialist Party of Great Britain and Questions of the Day"

Deals with the founding of the Socialist Party, the Liberal, Tory, Labour and Communist parties and the I.L.P., the Russian Dictatorship, War, Trade Unions, Social Reforms etc

80 Pages—Price 3d. (Post free—4d.)

Outdoor Propaganda Meetings

SEPTEMBER

	Sundays :	1st	8th	15th	22nd	29th
Brockwell Park	6 p.m.	Walker	Reginald	Banks	Ambridge	Walker
Queens Road, Bayswater	8 p.m.	Reginald	Banks	Ambridge	Walker	Reginald
Clapham Common	7 p.m.	Ambridge	Walker	Reginald	Banks	Ambridge
Regents Park	11.30 a.m.	Kohn	Goldberg	Cash	Clifford	Rubin
Finsbury Park	6 p.m.	Cash	Hayden	Berry, V.	Lestor	Godfrey
Ridley Road, Dalston...	8 p.m.	Lestor	Berry, V.	Rubins	Rubin	Berry, V.
Whipps Cross	7.30 p.m.	Callis	Lestor	Goldberg	Rubins	—
Cock Hotel	8 p.m.	—	Cash	Lestor	Hayden	Lestor
Victoria Park	5 p.m.	Hayden	Rubin	—	Cash	Rubins
Southend Sea Front ...	7 p.m.	Isbitsky	—	Isbitsky	—	Isbitsky
Saturdays :			Wednesdays :			
London Rd, Wembley (nr. L.M.S.Stn.), High Rd.	7.30 p.m.	Deanery Road, Water Lane, Stratford ...			8 p.m.	
Jolly Butchers Hill	8 p.m.	Highbury Corner, N.5			8 p.m.	
Ilford Station	8 p.m.	Hackney Town Hall			8 p.m.	
Essex Place, Chiswich	8 p.m.	Avenue Road, Clock Tower, Lewisham ..,			8 p.m.	
Roper Street, High Street, Eltham	8 p.m.	Thursdays :				
Mondays :		Ridley Road, Dalston, E.8.				8 p.m.
Ridley Road, Dalston, E.8	8 p.m.	" Salmon and Ball," Bethnal Green, E. ...				8 p.m.
Fridays :						
Becontree Station (near Park Gates)			8 p.m.			

BRANCH DIRECTORY

BATTERSEA.—Sec., 2, Hanbury Road, S.W.11. Branch meets Thursday, 8.30 p.m., at The Waiting Room, Latchmere Baths, entrance in Burns Road.

BIRMINGHAM.—Sec., E. Jesper, 38, Rollason Road, Erdington. Branch meets Jeans Café, Newton Street. First Wednesday in month at 8 p.m.

BLOOMSBURY.—Branch meets every Monday at 7.30 p.m., at A.E.U. Hall, 39, Doughty Street, W.C. (Near Grays Inn, Road.) Sec., S.P.G.B., 39, Doughty Street, W.C.1.

CENTRAL.—Membership obtained only through the Ex. Committee. Applications to General Sec.

CHISWICK.—Branch meets Fridays, 8 p.m., over Restaurant, 452 High Road, Chiswick, W.4. Communications to Sec., C. Curtis, 52, Parkstead Road, Putney, S.W.15.

DAGENHAM.—Branch meets alternate Wednesdays, from Sept. 4th, over "Ralphs Café," 7 Broadway, Chadwell Heath. Discussion after business. Lectures alternate Wednesdays from Sept. 11th. Communications to Sec. 5, Cannington Road, Dagenham, or P. Golding, "Basra," Boscombe Avenue, Hornchurch.

ECCLES.—Branch meets 1st and 3rd Mondays in month at Railway Temperance Room, Four Bridges, Wellington Road, 8 p.m. Discussion after Branch business. Non-members invited. Secretary, Mrs. F. Lea, 5, Gaskell Road, Eccles.

EDINBURGH.—Communications to Sec., D. Lamond, at 15, Barclay Place.

GLASGOW.—Branch meets every Tuesday at 7.30 p.m. at McLean Memorial Hall, Salt Market, Glasgow. Communications to T. N. Walshe, c/o Falconer, 100, Naburn Street, C.5.

HACKNEY.—Branch meets Friday, 7.30 p.m., at Old Gravel Pit Hall, Vallette Street, E.9. Lecture after each meeting. Communication to Sec., E. Chalkley, 21, Bridge Street, E.9.

HAMILTON.—Branch meets every 2nd and 4th Wednesdays of the month in McIntyre's Hall, 161, Lowwaters, at 7 p.m. Communications to T. Jones, 47, Hillside Crescent, Hamilton.

ILFORD.—Branch meets Mondays at 8 p.m. at 142, Richmond Road. Discussion after Branch business. Communications to Sec., at above address.

ISLINGTON.—All communications to F. W., 92, Wellington Road, Holloway, N.7. Branch meets on Fridays at 8 to 10.30 p.m., at Room 4, Co-operative Hall, 129, Seven Sisters Road, N.

LEYTON.—Communications to Sec., Dick Jacobs, 12, Clifford Rd., Walthamstow, E.17. Branch meets Thursday, 8 p.m., at Trades Hall, Grove House, High Road, Leyton.

LEWISHAM.—Branch meets Thursdays, at 8 p.m., at The Anchor Club Room, Lewisham Road. Sec. N. Taylor, 5, Hawke Road, Upper Norwood, S.E.19.

MANCHESTER.—Branch meets 2nd and 4th Mondays each month, at 8 p.m., at Craigwell Restaurant, Peter Street (entrance in South Street). Public invited. Sec., B. A. Lee, 19, Emery Avenue, Chorlton, Manchester.

PADDINGTON.—Branch meeting held on 2nd Friday each month, at 8 p.m., in the guild room over "Co-op. Stores," 447, Harrow Road, W.10. Literature Sec., W. Veal, 73, Wornington Road, W.10. Discussion on 4th Friday.

SHEFFIELD.—Sec., G. H. Southey, 112, Pickering Road, Sheffield, 3. Branch meets alternate Mondays, 7.30 p.m. at Room 2, A.E.U. Institute, Stanley Street. Meeting on 29th July.

SOUTHEND-ON-SEA.—Branch meets Wednesdays at 8 p.m., at 6, Hermitage Road, Westcliff. Discussion after branch business. Non-members invited. Communications to Sec., at above address.

SOUTHWARK.—Branch meets Fridays at 8 p.m., 43, Great Dover St., S.E.1. Communications to Sec., at above address.

STEPNEY.—Sec., H. Solley, 28, Gore Road, Victoria Park, E.9. Branch meets on Fridays, at 8 p.m., at Working Lads Institute (nr. Whitechapel Station).

TOOTING.—Branch meets 1st Sunday in the month, at 12 o'clock noon, at "The Springfield Social Club," 590, Garrett Lane, S.W.17. (Opposite Burntwood Lane). Sec., 174, Haydons Road, S. Wimbledon, S.W.19.

TOTTENHAM.—Branch meets 1st and 3rd Fridays in the month, 7, Bruce Grove, Room 2. Discussion after branch business. Public invited. Communications to C. Godfrey, 49, Napier Road, Tottenham, N.17.

WEST HAM.—Sec., P. Hallard, 22, Colegrave Road, Stratford, E. Branch meets Whitehall Schools, Parliament Place, Forest Gate, every Thursday at 8 p.m.

WEMBLEY.—Communications to H. G. Holt, 28, Charterhouse Avenue, Wembley, Middlesex. Branch meets every Friday at 8 p.m., at Cafe-Restaurant, over 170, High Road, Wembley. Discussion after branch business.

WOOD GREEN.—Communications to Sec. at 44, Boreham Road, Wood Green, N.22. Branch meets 2nd and 4th Wednesday in month at 8.30 p.m., Stirling House, Stuart Crescent.

THE SOCIALIST STANDARD

The Official Organ of **THE SOCIALIST PARTY** of Great Britain.

No. 374. Vol. 31]

London, October, 1935

[Monthly, Twopence

*Not altruism
but the lust
for profit is
the cause of
modern . . .
wars*

THE GREATER WAR

WITH the huge death-roll at Gresford still fresh in our minds comes the news of still further disasters of substantial proportions at South Kirkby and North Gawber, substantial enough to be classed as "acts of God," and absolve the colliery proprietors from liability for compensation.

The daily loss of lives in the mines, in the course of any given year, exceeds considerably that due to these occasional wholesale accidents. Thus in one industry alone the lust of capital for profit is satisfied only by the annual sacrifice of a thousand workers, with a correspondingly large number permanently maimed and diseased. Expensive machines for saving miners' wages have been

adopted widely since the war; means of saving miners' lives take second place. There are plenty of regulations to make mining safe, if that were possible, under capitalism, but the application of these regulations takes place under conditions which make "accidents" a practical certainty.

Miners, like all other workers under the present

social system, are wage-slaves. They are employed in the production of coal only in so far as that can be done at a profit to the colliery owners. This is the primary consideration, and miners' lives are cheap.

If miners were scarce enough to command £10 per week, other things remaining equal, a much more strict observance of safety regulations would speedily be enforced. As it is, men holding deputy certificates are ten a penny, and deputies who report the presence of gas with conscientious regularity soon find themselves out of a job. It is not necessary to have explosions, however, in order to kill miners. The *Barnsley Chronicle* of September 14th reported the inquests held upon the deaths of two youths employed at different pits in the district. In each case the victim succumbed to secondary infection arising from a minor injury. The similarity of the two cases led the Coroner to ask the medical officer concerned if there was any connection between these deaths and lack of nourishment.

"Yes! definitely!" was the reply. "Healthy individuals have falls and nothing happens to them. The boys' power of resistance must have been low to allow secondary infection."

Arduous toil, under conditions of risk comparable with those of warfare, fail to guarantee to the miners a sufficiency of food. They are regarded by some as heroes, by others as reckless fools, but it is neither folly nor bravery that sends them to their doom.

Like the sailors who go down to the sea in coffinships, the men in the shunting-yard, whose entrails are exposed to the tender mercies of the buffers, or the pottery-workers, whose existence is shortened by lead-poisoning, the miners are just poverty-stricken

ON OTHER PAGES

	Page
Trade Union Leaders in Confusion ...	210
Notes of the Month...	212
Capitalism v. Socialism	214
Educational Classes ...	215
Let the Capitalists Fight their Own Wars ...	216
The Future of Palestine	218
Notes by the Way ...	221
Meetings, &c. ...	222
Socialists and Russia...	223

slaves. They are victims of the class-war, in which all the casualties are on one side and the arms and financial resources are on the other. Their social position was neatly expressed in a prosecution reported in the issue of the *Barnsley Chronicle* previously quoted.

Two out-of-work miners had used their unemployed abilities to drive a heading into a seam of coal from the back of an outside cellar on a hill-side. They laid rails and lit the place with electricity. The inevitable air-shaft, however, gave them away, and the agents of the mineral owners speedily brought them to "justice."

These men had demonstrated their willingness to work in a practical way. They also appear to have astonished both the police and the mining engineer, who inspected the workings, by their up-to-date methods and ingenuity. Doubtless, in childhood they had read the parable of the talents, and heard sermons preached on the demoralisation that overtakes the idle. They determined to find occupation for body and mind and, incidentally, in a true British spirit of sturdy independence, find an alternative to relying on the public authorities.

They reaped their due reward—three months' hospitality from His Majesty!

The means of mining coal, among other things, belong to the members of the master-class, and the workers can apply their energies only by permission of these masters. The machinery of Government, including magistrates, police and prisons, exists to protect the property of the masters. In other words, it enables them to prevent the workers from working unless they agree to keep their masters in idleness and luxury by producing far more than they, the workers, require for their subsistence.

Capitalism is a system of robbery maintained by force. It is a war of parasites upon society, dealing out poverty, disease, injury and death to the producers of wealth in order that the balance-sheets may show a profit.

While numerous actual and would-be leaders of the workers try to interest them in wars in foreign lands, we of the Socialist Party call their attention to the greater war at home, from which there can be no peace till the day of their emancipation.

E. B.

Trade Union Leaders in Confusion

THE Sixty-seventh Annual Conference of the Trade Union Congress met in the shadow of war, and its President, Mr. Kean, opened the proceedings with a touching, if incoherent, appeal for peace. Italy, he said, must be coerced into keeping the peace, by means of economic and financial embargo and, perhaps, by closing the Suez Canal, even if such action led the League Powers into a war with Italy. That is, we must have peace at all costs, even if we have to go to war for it. The logic is shaky, but the meaning is clear enough. Another war to end war! And the T.U.C. and the Labour Party are as blandly ready to send the workers to the shambles as if the last war had never happened.

Mussolini, cries Mr. Kean, "knows no moral principle"—so "we" should bring out "our" poison-gases and long-range guns, to convince him how much loftier are "our" principles. Mussolini has made an "unjust and rapacious assault" on Abyssinia; so Great Britain, upheld by the comfortable conviction of moral superiority, given her by the tale of her just and generous acquisition of world empire, must teach him to play the game according to the rules. The subject races of the British Empire might inquire eagerly just what those rules are; but, of course, ignorant black men cannot be expected to comprehend civilised society. The British T.U.C. apparently does not comprehend it either. They spent days reading the riddle:

"When is a war not a war?" and reached the solution, "When the other side call themselves Fascists." Thus the Fascist is being used to fill the place occupied by the "Hun" in 1914; and the T.U.C.—together, be it noted, with the Communists, with whom they refuse to associate—tell the workers that it is their interest to take up arms against Fascism.

Leaders Mislead the Workers

What a highly convenient catchword is this "Down with Fascism" rallying-cry! Just the slogan needed to disarm the "Left-wing" resistance to war, and transform anti-militarist campaigns into frantic clamouring for the defence of Abyssinia. And these "leaders of the working class" are so muddle-headed in their principles and policy that they are voluntarily playing the game of the National Government—the very Government they have in the past so often and so bitterly attacked. Give them a war they can condone, a slogan obscuring the basic issue, and they readily, unreflectingly, follow the example of the Social-Democrats and others whose 1914-1918 war record will not bear examination.

The S.P.G.B. maintains that the "Fascism" aspect of the matter is the superficial excuse necessary to render war acceptable. The underlying issue is an economic one—the workers of all the countries involved are to be used as tools to make

possible the extraction of profit from Abyssinia. Great Britain is inextricably concerned, since Abyssinia is surrounded on almost all frontiers by British territory; since the Blue Nile, source of Egypt's essential floods, rises in Lake Tana; and since Eritrea and the Somalilands are on the route to India. The British capitalist group are not anxious for war at present; but neither do they want Italy to corner all the profits they foresee in the development of Abyssinia. Therefore, the politicians at Geneva and elsewhere have been treading the knife-edge of diplomacy, endeavouring to give Italy concessions large enough to stave off war, without actually giving Italy a monopoly of Abyssinian exploitation. The workers of the world have no interest in these jugglings. What reason is there for them to support one section of their exploiters against another? Whichever side wins the wage-slaves will still be wage-slaves; the basic problem of present society will remain unsolved.

The S.P.G.B. maintains, as it has done consistently throughout its thirty-one years' existence, that the workers' interests are inescapably opposed to those of the capitalists, whatever political and national trimmings the latter may use to mask their ends. When the workers open their eyes to the facts of their exploitation, and cease to be taken in by the multifarious propaganda of the capitalists and their tools, they will see that their own interests lie simply and only in an entirely new system of society—Socialism—and will struggle indefatigably to establish it. Under Socialism the entire absence of the profit motive will once and for all eradicate the cause of war. When the workers have set up Socialism, then, and only then, will war be impossible.

Equality for Women Workers

Not a word of this did we hear from the T.U.C., and equally indefinite and non-socialist was their attitude on Britain's internal problems. The economic position of women, the plight of the depressed areas, and the battle for shorter hours were all discussed from a purely reformist standpoint. All these problems are inherent in capitalism, but the T.U.C. conveys the impression that they can be solved piecemeal, without touching the basis of society. This impression is false: some improvements may benefit sections of the workers for a time, but the working class as a whole can never escape from exploitation by such painting the sores of capitalism. The first essential of capitalist society is an army of wage-slaves, people dependent for their lives on the sale of their energies in the labour-market; and the commodity labour-power commands only the price necessary for the labourer to continue his existence and reproduce his kind. That is, the workers as a whole—whatever differences and fluctuations may occur in particular sections at particular times—receive as the price of their

labour-power little more than enough to keep them alive. This is an integral part of capitalism. Suppose women succeed, as the T.U.C. hope, in obtaining equal wages with men. Are they any the less exploited wage-slaves? By all means let them, in common with all their class, fight against the encroachments of their masters, but let them not be deluded into believing that their principal task. They must realise that these encroachments can be made impossible only by doing away with the private ownership of the means of life, which produced their enemy, the master class.

The Workers a "Depressed" Class

The T.U.C., with penetrating insight into social cause and effect, further disclosed to an astounded world that "the stricken areas owe their lamentable position to the decline in their main industries." We have heard also that the circular movement of the globe on its axis may be explained as being due to the rotation of the earth. The T.U.C. was full of warm-hearted sympathy about the "shame and pity" of the depressed industries' situation, but spent no time analysing its true causes, or pointing the obvious way out. We state that these areas are "stricken" simply because the capitalists of this country cannot at present envisage making profits from them, owing to foreign competition and to more attractive investing fields elsewhere. Moreover, the whole working class all over the world is "stricken" and lives in a state of permanent "depression." The difference between these areas and others which receive less publicity is one of degree, and not of kind. It has been often and authoritatively stated that most workers, whether employed or not, have neither sufficient food, adequate clothing, nor sanitary homes. Such conditions are an integral part of capitalism.

Similarly, the question of hours is one which can never be solved so long as the human race is divided into two opposing camps, one owning the means of life and the other divorced from ownership, the one buying and the other selling labour-power. The buyers and sellers of labour-power have irreconcilable interests, and until private ownership and the buying and selling of labour-power is stopped for good, the haggling and wrangling over its price and time of its use must inevitably continue.

Down with all the War-makers

Finally, the T.U.C. decided to exclude Communists from holding official positions in Trades Councils. At about the same time the Communist Party announced its readiness to affiliate with the Labour Party. The T.U.C. officially stigmatised the Communists as a disruptionist element. Yet on the Abyssinian issue the Communist and T.U.C. policies are identical. So they blow hot and cold

and make confusion worse confounded. The S.P.G.B. has indeed every logical reason to claim that it alone, in this maze of capitalist politics, is treading the direct path to Socialism. The Communist Party's attitude in the Abyssinian crisis must have demonstrated unmistakably to many of its erstwhile supporters how capable that Party is of running with the hare and hunting with the hounds. Why further the declared policy of a capitalist Government? Why differentiate between national sections of the world capitalist class? To dam up Italian colonial expansion in Africa, which is so attractive to Italian capitalism, is merely to bring a European explosion so much nearer. To defend Abyssinia against Italy is merely to hand it over for capitalist exploitation by the native ruling class in alliance with Britain or France, or to split it up among various Powers. Abyssinia is due to be "civilised" by some capitalist group in any case.

But the Communist Party is willing to lead British workers to slaughter Italian workers under the banner "down with Fascism and war." They remind us of Butler's "Hudibras," whose

"Brain

Outweighed his rage but half a grain,
Which made some take him for a fool
That knaves do work with, called a fool."

Once again we must reiterate that these internecine squabbles, for all the fine phrases used as top dressing, are no concern of the working class. The paramount issue in the world to-day is the struggle for Socialism. The S.P.G.B. calls on the workers throughout the world to realise their class position, and to determine to end class-society and all its evils by organising consciously and politically for the one end, of establishing Socialism.

D. S.

Notes of the Month

Labour Party Problems

WHILST the Labour Party has officially declared for sanctions against Italy should the latter carry out its threat of attacking Abyssinia, this attitude has met with disapproval from many of its own members, including several prominent officials. Mr. Lansbury has threatened to resign his position as Leader because the application of sanctions may involve the use of armed force. He is now opposed to all wars, because "they are against the teachings of Christianity." He has now evolved a plan which will, in his opinion, put an end to all possibilities of wars in the future. This is nothing less than the "sharing of all the raw materials, markets and unoccupied territory of the world." He wants the League of Nations to appoint a commission of economic and scientific experts to draw up a scheme for carrying out these proposals. They could quite easily tell us how to meet the insistent demands of Italy, Germany and other nations for expansion, and how to pool natural resources, develop the markets, and satisfy the demands of the millions of people starving and sick in Asia, Africa and Europe." (*Daily Herald*, September 16th, 1935. Italics ours.)

That Mr. Lansbury can hope that the present owners of territory, mineral resources, etc., will relinquish or share their property unless forced to do so is sheer madness. That he expects such a scheme, even if carried out to "satisfy the demands of the sick and starving millions," is equally illusory. The "sick and starving millions" are the propertyless workers and peasants, and they are as much a feature of the countries already in

possession of raw materials, territory and markets such as Britain, France and the U.S.A. as they are of Germany, Italy Abyssinia, or any other country. The world now belongs to the capitalists and not to the workers, and if it is parcelled out in different proportions or pooled among the present owners, how can that benefit the proletariat?

"Pious" Enemy No. 2.

The Archbishop of Canterbury is also a Christian. Nevertheless, he can foresee circumstances in which a war may become "Christian." In his broadcast on September 1st he made it clear that, in his opinion, a war fought with the blessing of the League of Nations had also the blessing of the Church. We would add that history does not tell us of many wars in which the Church has withheld its "blessing."

Where Does he Stand?

Sir Stafford Cripps is the Chairman of the Socialist League, an organisation affiliated to the Labour Party. He is opposed to Labour's policy of sanctions, and does not agree with its support of the League of Nations. In an article in the *Sunday Referee* (September 15th, 1935), entitled "Where I Stand," he says: "While capitalism controls our national, and imperialism our international life, the actions of our Government will be determined by capitalist and imperialist interests." Correct, Sir Stafford, but how do you square that statement with your membership of the Labour Party, which plainly holds the opposite point of view?

United Front at Last

The Communists seem to have achieved their hearts' desire, that much-sought-after "United Front." And it is of a magnitude that must exceed their most sanguine hopes. For on the Italian-Abyssinian dispute they are solidly behind the National Government (or should we say in front of them?). The League's Covenant must be upheld by all means at our disposal," declared Sir Samuel Hoare, British Foreign Minister, in a speech at Geneva. And he has the solid support of the bulk of the Labour Party, the whole of the Liberal Party, and most certainly the Communist Party, who have issued impressive-looking proclamations, urging the public to support the League. As their sponsors at Moscow are now members of the League this is not surprising. But their attempts to explain their "policy" are ludicrous. Lenin's condemnation of the League as a "Thieves' Kitchen" still holds good with us, though the disciples of Lenin grace its functions. And what has become of their erstwhile boast, to "turn every imperialist war into a civil war"?

Where we Stand

"The people who do not own a country and its resources have nothing to fight for excepting Socialism"! That is our policy. The workers of Abyssinia, many of whom are still chattel-slaves, should not be inveigled into fighting for the property of Abyssinian princes. The workers of Italy have nothing to gain by fighting to secure more territory and raw materials for their masters. And the business of the workers the world over is not to take sides with either of the two Governments, or any other Government or League of Governments. Their business is to take the world out of the hands of the present owners and make it the possession of all. That is *not* the attitude of any other political party in this country.

Another Mining Disaster

Seventeen miners died as a result of an explosion in a coal mine near Barnsley (Yorks.) on September 12th. There have now been three big mining disasters this year, all claiming a heavy toll of life. These tragedies emphasise the conditions of workers who, for a pittance of less than £2 per week, have to risk their lives. And we often have to answer questions like: "Do not the capitalists have to risk their money in order to make a profit?" The miners are now preparing to struggle for an increase in their wages. Whilst we commend such struggles, we must at the same time point out that such a struggle, even if successful, will only mean a few more shillings a week. And we ask you miners: "How can you be satisfied with that when, by organising into the S.P.G.B., you can help obtain the *Means of Life*, including the mines, for society

as a whole." Then the risk to human life would be lessened and, in return for less arduous and unpleasant work, all the comforts of life would be yours.

A "Corrective" for Capitalism

"Capitalism is your servant and must never be your master—but it must be treated fairly. When it goes wrong, as it has gone wrong, it must be corrected." (Mr. Bennett, Canadian Premier, *Daily Herald*, September 13th, 1935.) We propose that the working class makes itself "master" of the political machine, and then administer one stroke—the appropriation of the land, factories, means of transport, etc., in the name of society.

"Men of Action" at Work

The German "Men of Action," Hitler and Co., assembled at Nuremberg, where the German Reichstag was called to deal with problems alleged to be of vital importance to the German workers. General Goering presented the first Bill, which provides that the Swastika flag shall become the State flag of Germany. Thus a tremendous victory was won for the German working population! Further evidence of the Nazi Government's concern for the conditions of the German workers was shown by the following new laws (*Daily Herald*, September 16th):—

For the protection of the German blood and honour, this law forbids the marriage between Jews and Germans or related lines.

Jews cannot hire German maids in their household under the age of 45.

The joy of German working people should be boundless. How different from Socialists, who are merely concerned with the solution of the problem of poverty!

Without Trimmings

The agenda of the Labour Party Conference, held at Brighton this month, contains several interesting items. A resolution submitted by the Southport Trades Council and Labour Party reads as follows: "That the next General Election be fought without trimmings, on the policy outlined at the Southport Conference, under the title of 'For Socialism and Peace,' special stress being laid upon:—

- (1) The immediate nationalisation of the land and all minerals.
- (2) The immediate establishment of a 40-hour week, with no reduction in economic circumstances.
- (3) The immediate raising of the school-leaving age to 15 years, with full maintenance during the last year at school.
- (4) General retirement from industry at the age of 60, with pension, such pension to be

raised to £1 per week for a single person and £2 per week for married couples.

"It is urged that this general and specific policy be a 'Stand or Fall' programme, and declares that it is the lowest minimum of policy as Socialists this Conference is prepared to tolerate."

So now you can "stand or fall" for "Socialism and Peace" with or without "trimmings"—and get "trimmed."

A further resolution submitted by the Warrington T.C. and L.P. reads as follows:—

"That this Conference, believing that there is a limit to the possibility of Social Reform legislation within the capitalist system, and realising definitely that the Labour Movement of this country has declared for a Socialist policy, agrees that the Movement should centre the whole of its propaganda and educational activities on making Socialism and Socialist Policy its only objective."

"The Conference further declares that the concentration of the Party on the support of the policy of doles and palliatives has become inimical to its Socialist objective, and that the next Labour Government should set out immediately to adopt such Socialist measures as will render such doles and palliatives unnecessary."

Everything depends upon what the people at Warrington mean by "Socialism" and "Socialist measures." But if they mean to change the Labour Party from a reformist organisation to a Socialist one their task is hopeless. The bulk of the Labour Party membership is not Socialist, and the job of converting them cannot be done from within. And

why trouble to change the Labour Party if there is already a party in existence whose only objective is Socialism, namely, the S.P.G.B.

Labour Party headquarters have shown what they think of the above resolutions by putting it at the tail-end of the agenda, under the heading of "Miscellaneous."

S.P.G.B. and the B.B.C.

Last year we approached the B.B.C. with a view to obtaining permission to put our case over the radio. We received a polite letter, informing us that arrangements had already been made for a representative of "Left-Wing Socialism" to broadcast. As we are not "Left-Wing," but Socialists, as, in fact, we belong to "no wing" of the Reformist Movement we repudiated the right of anyone to speak on our behalf, unless appointed by ourselves. Now we have again approached the B.B.C. and hope that these gentlemen will grant us the privilege that has not been denied to the other political organisations. If and when we get our turn we hope to be able to make it quite clear to the listeners that as the S.P.G.B. is the only party in this country that does not recruit support on questions of day-to-day legislation under capitalism but gets its backing solely on the issue of Socialism versus Capitalism, we have nothing in common with those who, calling themselves "Socialists," are, in fact, nothing of the kind. Scientific, revolutionary Socialism in Great Britain is represented by the S.P.G.B. S. RUBIN.

Capitalism v. Socialism

TRADE UNION OFFICIAL CITES RUSSIA!

THERE has lately come before us a copy of *The General and Municipal Workers' Journal* (June, 1935). Reminiscent of a parish magazine, its pages contain so many incorrect statements and samples of loose thinking that it would take several issues of the SOCIALIST STANDARD to deal with them individually. It may, however, be of interest to deal with the "Notes" of the General Secretary, Mr. Charles Dukes, especially those under the heading of "Capitalism v. Socialism." The United States is quoted as an example of capitalism, whilst Russia is referred to as "Socialist Russia." The General Secretary states that the disaster of capitalism in the United States is due to the fact that they have no policy for refunding their National debt, which has increased by nearly 12,000 million dollars as a result of the "New Deal" policy. The General Secretary should know, however, that national debts are not necessarily disliked by the capitalist class—who are the only people

concerned; in fact, some of them like them so well, that there is at the moment a widespread newspaper campaign for expanding armaments by means of a £250,000,000 loan, instead of by means of taxation.

A national debt is nothing more than a sum of money owed by the capitalist class as a whole to that section of the capitalist class which invests its money in war loans and other government securities. The incomes of the whole class are taxed in order to pay the interest to that section. National debts, therefore, are no indication of disaster to the capitalist class.

His remarks on Socialism show that Mr. Dukes knows not what this is. Our own definition of Socialism will be found by reference to our object on the centre page of every issue of the SOCIALIST STANDARD. As it is now fairly well known that the conditions in Russia do not correspond to this definition—in particular, the means of production are controlled, not democratically, but by

the controllers of the Communist Party—it will be obvious that Socialism has not been established in Russia.

Again, as under Socialism goods would be produced solely for use, the necessity of the exchange medium—money—would disappear, yet the General Secretary refers to "money," "income," and "expense," as part of the Russian "Socialist" economy. Another reason given for the "success" of "Socialist" Russia is, that she "does not seek the assistance of foreign loans." Here, again, he is wrong. Instances of foreign loans negotiated by the Bolsheviks have been recorded previously, but the following is a case in point:—

BIG LOAN TO SOVIET.

Prague, Monday.

Soviet representatives to-day signed an agreement with Czecho-Slovakian banks for a loan of £2,083,000 for five years at six per cent. to finance purchases of Czech manufactures by Russia.—British United Press.

(*News Chronicle*, June 4th, 1935.)

As to the nature of the "success" itself, this would appear to consist of the fact that there are insufficient workers for the available jobs, and that output in the heavy industries has increased as compared with a year ago. And this is the "success" of "Socialism"! It is, of course, simply the conditions which are regarded as successful under capitalism.

The case for Socialism as against capitalism can be put both correctly and much more simply. Briefly it is that capitalism—a system of society based upon the private ownership of the means of production—produces certain unpleasant effects upon an enslaved class called workers, viz.: poverty and insecurity most of the time, and, by way of a change, unemployment and war. It is, therefore, in the interest of the workers to completely change the basis of a society which produces such effects. As the opposite of private ownership is common ownership, Socialists advocate the replacement of the existing form of society by one based upon this common ownership of the means of production and distribution, namely, Socialism. This result can, however, only be achieved by a class-conscious working class organised for that purpose. It is for that purpose that the Socialist Party of Great Britain was formed, and it is up to all workers who agree with our position to join with us and help on with the work. Now, fellow workers, what about it? R. M.

"The Socialist Party of Great Britain and Questions of the Day"

Deals with the founding of the Socialist Party, the Liberal, Tory, Labour and Communist parties and the I.L.P., the Russian Dictatorship, War, Trade Unions, Social Reforms etc

80 Pages—Price 3d. (Post free—4d.)

EDUCATIONAL CLASSES

Admission Free

At HEAD OFFICE

Every Sunday at 4.0 p.m.

Oct. 13	"Economic Geography"	- - -	STEWART
20	"Value"	- - -	SANDY
27	"Pre Feudal Europe"	- - -	STEWART
Nov. 3	"Price"	- - -	WATERS
10	"France to 1789"	- - -	SNELGROVE

AT DAGENHAM BRANCH

Every Friday at 8.30 p.m., at Ralph's Cafe, 7 Broadway, Chadwell Heath.

Oct. 4	"Materialism"	- - -	KOHN
11	"Slave Civilisations"	- - -	STEWART
18	"Feudalism"	- - -	GOLDBERG
25	"Merchant Capitalism"	- - -	KOHN
Nov. 1	"Reformation and Puritan Revolution"	- - -	KOHN
8	"Industrial Revolution"	- - -	STEWART

At BATTERSEA BRANCH

Alternate Thursdays, at 8.30 p.m., at Latchmere Road Baths, Small Waiting Room (Burns Road).

Oct. 3	"Materialism"	- - -	WILMOT
17	"Feudalism"	- - -	WATERS
31	"Merchant Capitalism"	- - -	WATERS

At WEST HAM BRANCH

Alternate Thursdays, at 8.30 p.m., at Whitehall Schools, Parliament Place, Forest Gate.

Oct. 10	"Materialism"	- - -	CLIFFORD
24	"Feudalism"	- - -	HAYDEN
Nov. 7	"Merchant Capitalism"	- - -	L. OTWAY

At LEWISHAM BRANCH

Alternate Fridays, at 8.30 p.m., at The Anchor Club Room, Lewisham Road.

Oct. 18	"Materialism"	- - -	CASH
Nov. 1	"Industrial Revolution"	- - -	BRIGHTMORE

At STEPNEY BRANCH

Alternate Fridays, at 8.30 p.m., at Working Lads' Institute, Whitechapel Road, (opposite London Hospital).

Oct. 18	"Materialism"	- - -	WILMOT
Nov. 1	"Industrial Revolution"	- - -	STEWART

At CHISWICK BRANCH

Alternate Thursdays at 8 p.m., at 376, High Road, Chiswick.

Oct. 10	"Materialism"	- - -	CASH
24	"Slave Civilisations"	- - -	STEWART
Nov. 7	"Feudalism"	- - -	GOLDBERG

EDUCATIONAL VISITS

1st and 3rd Saturdays each month (3 p.m., sharp).

Oct. 5	Natural History, S. Kensington	- - -	REGINALD
	"Evolution"	- - -	
19	Victoria and Albert Museum	- - -	
	"Wood and the Home"	- - -	K. DEVEREUX

THE SOCIALIST STANDARD

OCTOBER,



1935

OFFICIAL NOTICE

All communications for the Executive Committee. Subscriptions for the *SOCIALIST STANDARD*, Articles, and Correspondence submitted for insertion therein, should be addressed—The Socialist Party of Great Britain, 42, Great Dover Street, London, S.E.1, to whom Money Orders should be made payable.

The meetings of the Executive Committee are held at the Head Office, every Tuesday, at 7.30 p.m.

TERMS OF SUBSCRIPTIONS.

Twelve Months, post free	2s. 6d.
Six Months, post free	1s. 3d.

Let the Capitalists Fight their Own Wars

IT has been a common experience of Socialist Party speakers in recent years that, when they have referred to the support given by the Labour Party and Trade Unions to the last Great War, opponents have replied that those happenings are now ancient history, and ought, in fairness, to be forgotten. "Never again," we were told, "would the Labour leaders and their followers fall into the trap set for them in 1914. They had learned their lesson for all time." Of course, they had done nothing of the kind. They have learned nothing and forgotten everything. Because the bait has been presented in another way they are walking into the same trap as they did 21 years ago. The *Manchester Guardian*, only a few months back, gave the Government its lead in the matter by raising the question whether a war waged under cover of the League of Nations (of which "Socialist" Russia is a member), could be regarded as a "Capitalist" war. The General Council of the T.U.C. used just the same argument to fog the issue at the recent Congress, and it has been featured several times in the Labour Party's privately-owned organ, the *Daily Herald*.

The League of Capitalist Governments

First let us examine the League of Nations. Its name obscures the truth. It is not a League of Nations, but a League of Governments, that is to say, it is directed and controlled by the representatives of the different sections of the capitalist class. If the importance of that is not at once apparent it is only necessary to point out that each of those Governments is occupied at home with the relent-

less suppression of the working class, by armed force if necessary. Never do those Governments set the armed forces in motion to promote or defend the interests of the working class, but always to protect capitalism and capitalist property rights. Yet we are asked to believe that these gentlemen undergo a surprising change on their journey to Geneva, and become representatives of the interest of humanity as a whole, or even of the working class in particular. Do our Labour Party opponents not recall that the same ridiculous spectacle was once a commonplace in the electoral field, of trade unionists voting into Parliament the very employers with whom they were engaged in bitter wages struggles?

Again, the League is an organisation of some of the Governments only, and this also is important. America, Japan and Germany are outside of it. It is dominated by France and England and is primarily an instrument for safeguarding the gains acquired by those Powers in the Great War. For a similar reason it is backed by the smaller countries, which gained territory, or whose very existence was the result of the Versailles Peace Treaty. The English League of Nations enthusiasts in Labour circles regard the League as an imperfect but highly commendable organisation. They have persuaded themselves that working class interests and League interests go hand-in-hand. They fail altogether to appreciate that their view is typically that of the Powers who dictated the Versailles and other Treaties—on friend and foe alike—and that the view of the other Governments and of the unthinking workers in their countries is a very different one. To the mass of German, Italian, Hungarian, Japanese and Turkish workers the League is regarded as nothing but the tool of Anglo-French capitalist imperialism. When, therefore, the Labour Party and Trade Unions line up and back the League they are separating themselves from the workers in those countries as rigidly as they did when they backed their capitalist Government in 1914-1918. They are destroying what is the only possible basis for securing Socialism and peace, that is the international solidarity of the working class. The only organisation which can ever hope to gain the confidence of the working class in other countries is the one which can show that it is not the direct or indirect tool of the capitalists at home. Its integrity and independence must be above suspicion.

New Bait for an Old Trap

The Trade Union leaders implore us to back the League in order to stop Fascism. "If Mussolini is allowed to win," they say, "then Fascism will triumph everywhere." A plausible argument, but it has a familiar odour. It stinks of 1914. "If the Kaiser is allowed to win then Prussian militarism will triumph everywhere. Make the world

safe for democracy." At the cost of millions of workers' lives the Kaiser was not allowed to win. And now Prussian militarism, in a revised and rather worse edition, is triumphant in Germany, and democracy is almost everywhere on the defensive against Fascism. Can they not see that, in addition to the destruction and suffering that war entails, it is itself a prolific breeder of all the violence and oppression in which Fascism flourishes and in which the Socialist movement stifles? The Labour leaders may pretend that a war resulting from League sanctions against Italy or some other Power, is a war against Fascism, but the Governments which will continue to have absolute control of the League and of their own armed forces are not going to fight against Fascism. They are going to fight in defence of capitalist interests. Indeed, many of the Governments—Spain, for example—are themselves making use of the violent repressive measures which go by the name Fascist, and if the capitalists in democratic countries find that similar methods suit their interests they also will try to use them. The truth is that capitalism is triumphant everywhere because the working class are blind to their own class position, and are still persuaded that they have an interest in leaving power in capitalist hands. It is only a degree worse that in some countries large numbers of workers go further on the road of stupid servility, and help to place power in the hands of Fascist demagogues. The only people who can end this are the workers themselves. When they sicken of Fascism they

will be well on the road to destroying it, but it can only be done from within the country concerned. Overthrowing Mussolini by war waged by rival capitalist Powers will only have the same kind of result as the overthrow of Kaiserdom had in Germany. It is the duty of each national section of the working class to struggle against their own capitalist masters, aided to the extent that is possible by the international movement. Backing a League of Nations war will not help, but will hinder the spread of understanding and organisation among the workers everywhere. It is the policy of unchaining ten mad dogs of war to deal with one of them.

Junior Partner or Doormat?

Alongside their other arguments the Labour leaders who support war under League auspices profess to believe that by lining up with the Government they will exercise great influence on the Government's conduct of the war and on the eventual peace settlement. What does the last Great War tell us about this? The Labour Party, when it joined the war-time Coalition Government, told us it was going to see that the peace was a real and lasting peace, not the dictation of onerous terms by victors to vanquished. Some of the Labour leaders (those who were not too much choked up with vile jingoistic sentiments themselves) gave their advice accordingly. And

what amount of notice did the Government take of their advice? Not the slightest as regards the main terms of the settlement. For proof ask any Labour leader if he is prepared to defend the

THE SOCIALIST PARTY OF GREAT BRITAIN

OBJECT.—The establishment of a system of society based upon the common ownership and democratic control of the means and instruments for producing and distributing wealth by and in the interest of the whole community.

DECLARATION OF PRINCIPLES

THE SOCIALIST PARTY of Great Britain HOLDS—

1. That society as at present constituted is based upon the ownership of the means of living (i.e., land, factories, railways, etc.) by the capitalist or master class, and the consequent enslavement of the working class, by whose labour alone wealth is produced.

2. That in society, therefore, there is an antagonism of interests, manifesting itself as a class struggle, between those who possess but do not produce, and those who produce but do not possess.

3. That this antagonism can be abolished only by the emancipation of the working class from the domination of the master class, by the conversion into the common property of society of the means of production and distribution, and their democratic control by the whole people.

4. That as in the order of social evolution the working class is the last class to achieve its freedom, the emancipation of the working class will involve the emancipation of all mankind without distinction of race or sex.

5. That this emancipation must be the work of the working class itself.

6. That as the machinery of government, including the armed forces of the nation, exists only to conserve the monopoly by the capitalist class of the wealth taken from the workers, the working class must organise consciously and politically for the conquest of the powers of government, national and local, in order that this machinery, including these forces, may be converted from an instrument of oppression into the agent of emancipation and the overthrow of privilege, aristocratic and plutocratic.

7. That as all political parties are but the expression of class interests, and as the interest of the working class is diametrically opposed to the interests of all sections of the master class, the party seeking working-class emancipation must be hostile to every other party.

8. THE SOCIALIST PARTY of Great Britain, therefore, enters the field of political action determined to wage war against all other political parties, whether alleged labour or avowedly capitalist, and calls upon the members of the working class of this country to muster under its banner to the end that a speedy termination may be wrought to the system which deprives them of the fruits of their labour, and that poverty may give place to comfort, privilege to equality, and slavery to freedom.

Those agreeing with the above principles and desiring enrolment in the Party should apply for membership form to secretary of nearest branch or at Head Office.

savage terms of the Versailles Treaty; ask if he is prepared to say that the Labour Party's advice was taken and that he stands by the result.

Again, consider the special question of the Trade Unions. They helped British capitalism to win the war. One of their spokesmen wrote a pamphlet in 1914 defending their support of the war on the ground that if the "Huns" won they would reduce English Trade Unions down to the level of the German Unions. The German capitalists did not win, but in 1926 the English capitalists made a frontal attack on the British Trade Union movement in order to help the mine-owners force down the miners' wages. They followed it up in 1927 by legislation severely restricting the legal rights of the Trade Unions.

What happened? Where was the influence of the Labour leaders on the British capitalists and their Government? What reward or consideration did they get for having helped capitalism to win the war? None whatever. Not a shred. Force, naked force, was the order of the day. The Labour M.P.s and Trade Union officials threatened and bluffed, wept and pleaded. They appealed to sentiment, patriotism, religion, to the preservation of order, and even to the interest the capitalists themselves have in exercising power with mercy. And they got precisely nothing.

Now they ask the working class to line up with British and French capitalism in defence of democracy and peace! They have learned nothing. Even the greatest war the world has ever known—yet—could not teach them.

The Future of Palestine

The Secretary, Amhurst Road, E.8.
THE SOCIALIST STANDARD, August 25th, 1935.
42, Gt. Dover Street,
S.E.1.

Dear Sir,

Kaye and Scrutator have gone to great lengths and to a good deal of trouble to show the fallacies of Zionism and the utter uselessness of a Jewish State. In their eagerness to "prove" their theories they have written quite a number of words, quoted a lot of phrases torn from their context, said quite a lot of irrelevant (and shallow) things, but have not given one single and valid reason why the Jewish people, out of all other peoples who inhabit this unhappy earth, should *not* possess a country of their own, where they should be able to lead a normal national life, unhampered and unhindered by the tremendous forces which, everywhere, make Jewish life a burden and an encumbrance.

In their quotations referring to conditions in Poland, they show that prominent Jewish employers refuse to employ Jewish labour. In a Jewish State this would, of course, be automatically impossible. On the other hand, they blame the Zionist authorities for disqualifying Jews from membership from the Z.O. who do *not* employ Jewish labourers! This is only one glaring example of the shallowness of your writers.

There are many more. "Many Jewish workers in Germany," they state, "knew the terrors of unemployment long before the coming of Hitler" (does this mean that Hitler is, after all, not such a bad fellow?). Precisely so. Only that this fact, which also refers to Poland and many other countries, proves conclusively how necessary it is for the Jewish people to have a country of their own, where they will not be subjected to unemployment because they are Jews, and where, since your scribes seem to be so deeply concerned about the religious requirements of the Jewish workers, a Jewish Government will impose Saturday as a day of rest.

One does not know whether it is sheer stupidity or malice when your writers assert that "in the more developed capitalist countries, conditions are not so favourable for the growth of anti-Semitism." In view of what has been happening in one of these "more developed capitalistic countries"—Germany—where even the "joint control of huge undertakings by Jewish and non-Jewish capitalists" does not tend to "weaken racial prejudice," one must be utterly blind or foolish to state that there "is

little danger from pogroms in advanced capitalist countries," when for 2½ years there has been one continuous, incessant and intensive pogrom of the most efficient and gigantic variety, and where Jewish capitalists, middle-class people and Jewish workers alike have been mercilessly and ruthlessly ousted from their homes and positions and are prevented from earning a living and doomed to certain death and extinction. The same process, only not so thorough, goes on in Poland and in Rumania, and elsewhere, where the ruling and capitalistic class are not at all afraid that anti-Jewish "riot and bloodshed would upset the delicate mechanism of capitalist trade and finance."

"Even in Germany," your scribes console us, "at the height of the Nazi triumph, there has not been a pogrom of a Czarist character." Is then a pogrom less beastly and cruel because it takes place, like in Germany, not in the open market-place, but in the concentration camp or in the subterranean passages of the Brown Shirt Headquarters? Or are all the reports contained in the Brown Book and in the hundreds of newspapers mere figments of the imagination, and the result of what Hitler and his gangsters call "Greuel-propaganda"?

As to the unlikelihood of anti-Jewish riots in a city like London, perhaps I may refer your scribes to what happened in a "city like Berlin" only a week or two ago, on the Kurfuerstendamm, where "valuable property in which many non-Jews are interested" exists, and where the police had no desire to "keep such a mob in hand."

The extremely complicated Jewish problem is not at all safe even in the hands of the working classes. In Germany and in Poland, Rumania and elsewhere, the working classes are the first to destroy Jewish property and mutilate Jewish lives, and we have even read in the London *Daily Worker* that the slaughter of Jews in Palestine in 1929 was the rising of the Arab masses against Jewish exploitation. Jewish exploitation by 65 poverty-stricken Talmud students in the "Yeshibah" of Hebron! We have also seen how a Labour Government, then in full power, instigated a slaughter of 150 Jews in Palestine in August, 1929, how that Government treated the all Jewish demand for protection with the greatest and cruellest callousness, how that chief culprit, Lord Passfield, an avowed Socialist, and then in charge of the Colonial Office, has, as a result of the ghastly slaughter by Arabs of Jews, punished the Jews, curtailed their rights, suppressed their aspirations, and

rewarded the Arab murderers, extended their rights and encouraged them in their devilish designs. It was that very Socialist who said that he had no sympathy with the aspirations of the new generation of *working* Jews, but that he understood and sympathised with the old, the pious, i.e., the idle, Jews! So much for the safety of the Jew under a *Labour* Government. That Labour Government, too, was unable, or unwilling, to "keep such a mob in hand," and allowed the iniquity to go unpunished. The Mufti, that arch-murderer, is still a *persona grata* with the British authorities.

It will thus be seen that there is no remedy for the Jewish problem except a Jewish State. It has long been recognised that all classes of Jews not only suffer in common with all classes of humanity, but that they are subjected to very special—and inevitable—sufferings and persecutions which are alone the result of their being a pariah among the nations for the last nineteen centuries. All attempts to solve this vicious problem have so far failed. As a Zionist theoretician puts it: "To be robbed as a Jew is equally humiliating, equally hurtful to the self-respect of the Jew, as it is to be protected as a Jew." Judeophobia is an hereditary form of demonopathy, peculiar to the human race, and anti-Semitism is based upon an inherited aberration of the human mind.

No people, generally speaking, has any predilection for foreigners. This has its ethnological basis and cannot be brought as a reproach against any people. But the Jews, more than any other people, are subject to this dislike. Every foreigner is more or less respected because he can repay in his own country with the same coin. The Jew, alone, because he has no country, remains the stranger "par excellence." He remains a refugee always, and who is the refugee to whom a refuge cannot be refused?

The real panacea for the Jewish problem, and the only one, is and remains a Jewish State. And in that State, according to the best Jewish and Zionist traditions and teachings, there shall be "one law for the citizen as well as for the stranger that dwelleth in its gates."

I am, Sir,

Yours faithfully,

JACOB SARNA.

REPLY.

It is a pity that Mr. Sarna offers no evidence to support his accusation that we have torn phrases from their context in our anxiety to misrepresent the Zionist position. Our correspondent, evidently, does not share our eagerness to "prove" things.

The attitude of our critic is that of a nationalist. He writes about Peoples. We analyse society in terms of classes. To him the Jewish "problem" is the problem of the Jewish people. To us all problems are to be examined in the light of working-class interests. A considerable divergence of opinion is expected in these circumstances.

We should be glad to learn more about this "normal national life" from which Jews are debarred. May we remind Mr. Sarna, that in the United States of America, one of the wealthiest countries in the world, according to Senator T. H. Caraway, there were in 1930 1,000 deaths a day from starvation (*Daily Telegraph*, February 2nd, 1931). There are now about 12,000,000 unemployed, and millions more are in misery and want. Here in England, hundreds of thousands of people are on the borderline of starvation. Surely this is not what Mr. Sarna, and those who think with

him, are striving so hard to attain? We are afraid it is. Palestine must be developed on capitalist lines, they say; then it will produce the same conditions. We suggest that it is precisely these conditions which are the "tremendous forces" that hamper and hinder Jewish workers, and all workers, the world over.

It is obvious that in a Jewish State where presumably the bulk of the population would be Jewish, the employing class would have no option but to exploit Jewish workers, unless they had facilities for importing cheaper labour. What of the cheap negro and continental labour which the American capitalists imported into "God's own country"? Industrial history is full of examples of how employers have used "foreign" labour to break down strikes or to lower the standard of living. Furthermore, we did not, as Mr. Sarna suggests, *BLAME* the Zionists Authorities for any of their actions. We merely gave this information in order to prove that it was unnecessary for the Jews to wait for Sir Oswald Mosley or Adolf Hitler to make them unemployed, as Mr. Smilansky and his capitalist colleagues in Palestine, Manchester, London, and Warsaw have no compunction, when their interests dictate, in sacking their "fellow" Jews. A capitalist, be he Jewish or British, in London or in Jerusalem, has as his first consideration, the making of profits.

Mr. Sarna objects to Jewish workers being unemployed because they are Jews. We go further. We object to Jewish workers, and all workers, being subjected to unemployment because they are surplus to the needs of capitalist industry. Our argument is that the overwhelming majority of unemployed Jewish workers are such because they are privileged to enjoy some of the blessings of our "normal national life." This is not a defence of Hitler. It merely proves that Hitler and other individuals are not responsible for the existence of unemployment. Why Mr. Sarna believes we are deeply concerned about the religious requirements of Jews, is a mystery yet to be solved.

Our correspondent betrays his ignorance of German political conditions, and we must advise him to make sure of his facts before he again rushes into print. One of the reasons for Hitler's advent to power is that the German workers had not yet become accustomed to the altered political conditions since the setting up of the capitalist republic after the War. There are also millions of small property owners, peasants, and petty proprietors of workshops in Germany, and these people are very susceptible to anti-Semitic propaganda. Large areas in Germany, are as yet, relatively untouched by industrial development. Mr. Sarna should also keep in mind that most of the Nazi victims in concentration camps are political prisoners, and in view of the support given by numbers of Jews to the Social Democratic Party,

it is not surprising to find some of them there together with Communists and Catholics. There is one other point; Mr. Sarna's attitude, and that of other Jews, to this vexed question of brutality and violence, is peculiar and rather limited. They fume with indignation over the atrocities of Hitler, but are strangely silent when the name of Mussolini is mentioned. Marshal Pilsudski, the late dictator of Poland, well known as a pogrom-inciter during and immediately after the War, was lauded to the skies in the Jewish Press on his death. Our sympathies are much larger than Mr. Sarna's. We also sympathise with the workers who are ill-treated for their political views. Nor would the establishment of a Jewish State on Revisionist lines safeguard the Jewish workers from brutalities at the hands of their "brother" Jews. In order to show how closely the Revisionist organisation is modelled on Fascist lines we shall give a further quotation. In the "Blue-White papers, 1935," published by the Revisionists, there appears a short account of the brown-shirted Revisionist youth organisation, the *Berit Trumpeldor*. The following are some clauses from their "Heptalogue":—

- (1) The Jewish State as the purpose of your own life.
- (2) "Monism" in the sense of rejecting all subservience to slogans not connected with the Jewish State, especially that of the "Class War".
- (4) The duty of self-defence, and readiness to join a Jewish Legion should necessity arise.

As regards the destruction of valuable property in the streets of Berlin some weeks ago, the "valuable property" destroyed consisted of some broken windows, tables, chairs, crockery, and some smashed windscreens (see *Jewish Chronicle*, 19/7/35).

We do not understand why Mr. Sarna should have brought *The Daily Worker*, Lord Passfield, and the Labour Government, into the discussion. Mr. Sarna must know that we are opposed to the Communist Party and the Labour Party. It is absurd of Mr. Sarna to try to foist responsibility for *The Daily Worker's* nonsense, and the Labour Government's colonial policy on to the Socialist Party.

Therefore we are on unassailable ground when we urge the Jewish workers not to waste their energies struggling for something out of reason, and which, if achieved, would confer very doubtful and dubious advantages on them, and urge them to assist us in the task of establishing Socialism. The disabilities they suffer as Jews are inextricably bound up with the far greater disabilities they suffer as members of the working class.

Mr. Sarna believes that anti-Semitism is based upon an "inherited aberration of the human mind." We contend that anti-Semitism in the modern world is mainly a smoke screen used by nervous sections of the ruling class in order to distract the minds of the workers, and to cover the

class struggle. It is a means of diverting class-antagonism into racial hatred, and of splitting the workers into warring groups. By trying to fool the workers with fairy stories about the intrigues of secret councils of Jews planning to overthrow all Christian states; of conspiracies of "Jewish" capital, it is hoped to discourage revolutionary ideas. Anti-Semitic propaganda can flourish best where there is an inexperienced and uninformed working class. The only real solution for the Jewish problem is the spread of Socialist knowledge, which teaches the workers that the main struggle is between worker and capitalist. It dispels the illusion, fostered by Zionist and anti-Semite alike, that racial and national distinctions are of concern to the workers.

The spread of Socialist knowledge will bring nearer the day when we can say good-bye to capitalism, and build up a Socialist system of society, which will involve the "emancipation of all mankind without distinction of race or sex."

Instead of this, Mr. Sarna offers to Jewish workers something which will not bear a moment's examination, as can be seen from the opening paragraph of his letter. He asks why the Jewish people, out of all other peoples who inhabit this unhappy earth, "should not possess a country of their own." Note these words, "possess a country of their own." We challenge Mr. Sarna to show us how it will be possible for Palestine to be possessed by the Jewish people, in view of the fact that it is to be run on strictly capitalist lines, which means, of course, that it will be monopolised by the capitalist class, like all those other countries at which Mr. Sarna casts such envious eyes, but which he himself dubs "unhappy."

KAYE & SCRUTATOR

ANSWERS TO CORRESPONDENTS

"Use of New Logic" (Yarmouth.) We do not publish anonymous letters.

J. Cohen (E.3); F. S. Waterfield (N.); W. T. Raynor (Pinner). Replies held over.

ED. COMM.

HOW TO GET TO HEAD OFFICE.

Great Dover Street is a turning out of Borough High Street, near Borough (Underground) Station. The station is on the line from Morden to Hampstead and Highgate, and lies between the Bank Station and Elephant and Castle.

EDUCATIONAL VISITS

A capital start was made on September 7th with our series of Educational Visits. Comrade Kersley threw illuminating sidelights on art in relation to the Materialist Conception of History at the Tate Gallery. It is hoped to extend to more than the twenty auditors who listened to our comrade the benefit of his knowledge by means of a lantern lecture later on. Offers of loan of lantern to organiser. If successful, other Educational Visits will be also supplemented in the same way.

Notes by the Way

What Mussolini did for Italy

HERE is a brief description of the lofty principles on which the Fascist Government has trained its boys and young men, under the guise of "education."

These minds have been saturated with bellicose sentiments. The word Fatherland has lost for them its meaning, apparently obsolete, of love for the native land and its inhabitants, and has come to signify a proud and pugnacious attitude to the foreigner. While they were still boys the rifle and the machine-gun were put into their hands. All their Sundays were spent in military exercises. In their elementary school they were taught from a State text-book in which the martial virtues were exalted as the best virtues of a citizen. Indeed, later on they were taught that the citizen in Italy is from 6 to 60 a soldier, and that Italy, in the words of the chief of Fascism, must be a "military, militaristic, and warlike nation." (*Times*, September 5th.)

Capitalist Crisis and Capitalist War

Sir George Paish, in a letter to the Press, recently drew attention to an aspect of the Abyssinian conflict which has received little notice, that is the similarity between the condition of Italy now and in 1896, when also war was waged on Abyssinia.

"At that time the world was suffering from a severe economic and financial crisis, and the distress of Italy caused her statesmen to seek relief in a policy of conquest. The world to-day is suffering from a crisis more severe than 40 years ago, and Italy is in even greater distress than she was then. In consequence, Italy desires a colony to give her a market for her products, to which her people can emigrate, and from which she can obtain food, raw material, and gold . . . economic and financial distress is the real cause of the difficulty." (*Times*, August 31st.)

Here we have from a world-famed economist, who hopes and believes that capitalism can and should be saved, a fairly frank admission that capitalism is at the root of modern wars.

The Rate of Increase of Output in Industry

The rash speculations of Douglasites and others about a supposed vast and rapid increase of output in industry, due to the introduction of improved machinery and processes, have received additional refutation in a survey of output in the *Economic Journal* (September, 1935), by Ely Devons, of the Economic Research Section, Victoria University of Manchester. Basing his survey on the census of production and other material, he finds that the increase of output per head of the workers in all manufacturing industry in this country increased by at least 14 per cent. in the six years from 1924 to 1930. He thinks the actual figure will be somewhat larger than 14 per cent. for reasons given in the article. Making a reasonable allowance for this, it will be seen that

the increase per annum is rather less than 3 per cent.

Taking the smaller range of industries which are covered by the Board of Trade's index of production he finds that the increase of output per head of the workers actually in work was 20 per cent., or a little more, in the nine years 1924—1933. This again is well below 3 per cent. a year.

These estimates agree with others given in the *SOCIALIST STANDARD* from time to time.

The Output in Mining and Iron and Steel

A writer in *Forward* (August 24th), who shares the misconception that productivity increases at a "tremendous" rate, gives figures relating to coal-mining, an industry in which a great deal of machinery has been introduced. He claims that after allowing for the big reduction in the total output of coal, for the decrease in the number of miners, and for the greater amount of short time, output per head has increased by 30.4 per cent. in the ten years 1923—1933. Even if this were the whole story the increase each year would still be less than 3 per cent. of the previous year's output. Actually, however, it leaves out of account any additional labour used up in the manufacture and maintenance, etc., of the machines, also the fact that the output per head in 1923 represented a big decrease as compared with 1913 (from 260 tons a year to 229 tons).

On the other hand, miners' hours of work are shorter than before the War.

If these modifications are allowed for it will be seen that miners' output per head now as compared with that in 1913 has increased at the outside by not much more than 2 per cent. a year. The rate of increase in recent years may have been somewhat larger, but much of this has merely made up for the previous decline in output due, among other causes, to the fact that coal becomes more difficult to get at as the mines become more worked out.

An estimate of the increase of productivity in engineering, shipbuilding and iron and steel, based on the index of output published by the Royal Economic Society, and on the number of workers actually at work in these trades, shows that output per head between 1924 and 1930 increased by about 3 per cent. a year.

Major Douglas puts his Cards on the Table

There is certainly one thing for which Major Douglas deserves praise, that is for his very definite statement of his attitude towards the Alberta Social Credit Government. He might, had he wished, have expressed vague and qualified

approval without committing himself to anything definite. Instead, in an article in the *Sunday Express*, he stated in plain language exactly what he believes the Alberta experiment will produce. As we know that the application of the Douglas theories will fail to achieve the results Major Douglas anticipates, it is a suitable occasion to place on record what he wrote in the *Sunday Express* on September 1st, 1935. The following passages are extracted from the article in question:

Mr. Aberhart, the new Prime Minister, is a man of magnetic personality and a magnificent orator. In the heat of the election he went rather beyond any proposals that I have made, *but it is entirely false to say that I am in disagreement with him, I admire him greatly.*" (Italics ours.)

He promised during the election to pay every Albertan five pounds a month. I hope and believe that once his plans are in full operation that figure will be substantially increased.

If the credit of a rich province is made fully available to its people without artificial restrictions of any kind, *there will be no poverty. Everyone will have enough to eat, a decent home, opportunities for recreation and adequate leisure.*

That, I believe, will happen in Alberta if the new Government sticks to its policy. It will probably take fifteen months before the plan is in full operation, and that fifteen months will be a period of great difficulty and bitter strife. The vested interests of the bankers and financiers will not relinquish their monopoly without a hard struggle.

In 15 months from now, I believe that Alberta will be a blessed land. Unemployment will no longer be a menace to its citizens. No wheat will rot in its elevators. Fine new roads will enable tourists to appreciate its magnificent scenery and bring further wealth to its people.

It will become one of the show places of the world.

Capitalism and Superior Brains

Ousted from one position after another, defenders of capitalism finally fell back on the "superior brains." The capitalist, we are told, provides all the brain-power, the ideas, the organising skill and directive ability. His was the creative genius, without which the wage and salary earners would be floundering about in muddle and chaos.

The creative geniuses of capitalism finally produced the world war and the world crisis and, in passing, they turned whole counties of Great Britain into distressed areas, where idle men and idle mills rotted together. And what about the "superior brains" meanwhile? Having produced the chaotic conditions, are they setting to work to produce a remedy? By no means. Instead, the Chairman of the Whitehead Iron & Steel Co., Ltd., of Newport, Monmouth, is offering a prize of £1,000, with additional prizes of £200 for practical suggestions for "permanently and substantially reducing existing distress in South Wales and Monmouthshire (*Daily Telegraph*, August 31st).

You send your answers to the Industrial Development Council of South Wales. We know the answer, but we fear nobody will receive a prize for sending it in.

"200 Companies Own Half U.S."

Under the above heading the *Star* (August 3rd) publishes a report from Reuter's Agency, stating that, according to the American Bar Association, about 200 Corporations, managed by approximately 1,000 directors, own one-half of the wealth of the United States. These 200 corporations do not include banks.

"A small number of corporations exercise a dominant influence over price control and trade practices, and virtually control the production and distribution of the country," a report by the Association states. H.

SOCIALIST PARTY OF CANADA.

Head Office and Headquarters of the Socialist Party in Canada, 194, Market Avenue, Winnipeg, Man.

Will all those interested in the development of a revolutionary Socialist Party, and desirous of obtaining further information, write to the official Secretary, F. Neale, 179, Bannatyne Avenue, Winnipeg, Man.?

Those requiring books or pamphlets on Socialism, or wish to subscribe to the SOCIALIST STANDARD, official organ of the S.P. of G.B. (subscription rates, 75 cents a year), write to Literature Agent, c/o F. Neale, 179, Bannatyne Avenue, Winnipeg.

CORRECTIONS.

Two unfortunate mistakes were made in the August issue. At the top of column two on page 184, "a tanner a day for dockers," should read "a tanner an hour for the dockers."

The last two words on the front page of the same issue, "tiny majority," should read "tiny minority." ED. COMM.

THE WORKERS' SOCIALIST PARTY (U.S.A.)

Readers in U.S.A. are invited to communicate with the Workers' Socialist Party at 132, East 23rd Street, New York City, where the SOCIALIST STANDARD is obtainable.

BLOOMSBURY

Meetings will be held at A.E.U. Hall, 39, Doughty Street, W.C.1. (corner of Guildford Street), at 8.30 p.m. each Monday evening.

Oct. 7 Discussion on "Socialism and Sanctions." Opened by D. GINSBERG

" 15 - - - - - "Religion and War" ROBERTUS

" 21 - - - - - "The Olean in Politics" A. KOHN

" 28 - - - - - "Eugenics and the Social Problem" A. JAMES

All invited. Admission free. Questions and Discussion.

Socialists and Russia

August 6th, 1935.

Dear Sir,—I was listening to your speaker at Finsbury Park on Sunday evening, August 4th, when he remarked that the Soviet Government had issued loans from 7 to 12½ per cent. profit to subscribers, and hinted that by inviting foreigners to invest they are acting just as State capitalists and that the workers are nothing more or less than wage slaves. May I point out that these loans are used for construction of Socialistic industries and that the bulk of Russian workers, numbering several millions, are subscribers towards the loans, knowing full well the purpose to which the money is being put. The interest given is certainly an incentive, but it should be pointed out by your speaker that as these loans are spread over an enormous number of subscribers the profit accruing to an individual investor is very small and cannot exercise any influence. Also, the number of foreign investors is estimated at less than one per centum (1%) of the total.

The Bolsheviks are practical realists and know full well the impossibility of abolishing wages at the present time. As a matter of fact, this is not so very important, but what is much more essentially valuable is that the ownership and control of the means of production and distribution is held firmly in the hands of the workers themselves. If this is not practical Socialism, what is? Can it be denied that the Bolsheviks took over a graveyard and have now progressed at an amazing rate? Can it be denied that the material well-being of the Russian workers is improving from year to year, and that, to my mind, is the acid test, whether they are wage-slaves or overcoming the conditions of wage-slavery that is inherent in private capitalism.

Your speaker boasted that he is upholding the truth. Therefore he should amplify statements that are likely to be misrepresented by mischievous and unscrupulous individuals.

I remain,

Yours faithfully,

H. JACKSON.

REPLY.

The principal issues raised by our correspondent are: (1) Whether the social system in Russia is Socialist or Capitalist; (2) Whether the bondholders are all small investors; (3) Whether industry is progressing, and (4) Whether the material conditions of the workers are improving.

For replies to the various points, our correspondent is referred to the pamphlet "The S.P.G.B. and Questions of the Day," and to the SOCIALIST STANDARD, October, 1934.

Brief replies are also given below:—

(1) Socialists from Marx onwards are agreed that characteristic features of Socialism are the common ownership and democratic control of the means of production and distribution; the production of goods only for use, not for sale; the abolition of all forms of income from the ownership of property; the abolition of the system of wage-labour; and the consequent disappearance of privilege.

Are these things found in Russia to-day? Certainly not. The Communist clique which controls the State machine maintains control of Russian industry as rigid as the control of the British Government over the Post Office. Goods are produced for sale, and at a profit. Rent, interest and profit from the ownership of property, bonds, etc.,

is a normal and growing feature of economic life. As our correspondent admits, the Bolsheviks, so far from having abolished the system of wage-labour, "know full well the impossibility of abolishing wages at the present time." Lastly, by various means, including the great and growing inequality of pay between the masses of workers and the high-salaried officials, privilege is enjoyed by a fortunate minority.

(2) It is true that the great majority of bondholders own only small amounts of bonds, but exactly the same plea is made in England and America by the defenders of capitalism. In Russia, although precise figures are not available, it is known that some of the bondholders own large or comparatively large amounts. But in any event, this is beside the point. Under Socialism there will be no investors.

(3) The S.P.G.B. has not questioned the claim that Russian industry (like industry in Japan, Turkey, and other countries) has expanded rapidly since the war.

(4) The S.P.G.B. has not denied that the standard of living has risen since the Bolsheviks obtained power. That does not mean, however, that we accept all of the extravagant claims made by some Communists. Russia is a country in which rigid censorship and suppression of independent working-class organisation is the normal order of things. As, therefore, it is impossible to hear the unfettered expression of the opinion of the workers themselves, we must accept with caution the claims made by the Russian Government since that Government has the usual interest in presenting the facts in a favourable light.

In conclusion, we would ask our correspondent a question. Seeing that the Russian economic system is not Socialism because it lacks the essential features of Socialism, will he tell us by what name he would describe it other than the one used by our speaker, "State capitalism."

ED. COMM.

THE SOCIALIST STANDARD

Fill in and post to Literature Secretary, 42, Great Dover Street, London, S.E.1, and get this paper regularly.

Please send me THE SOCIALIST STANDARD regularly for 12 months, for which I enclose 2s. 6d. (for six months, 1s. 3d.)

Name

Address

Outdoor Propaganda Meetings

OCTOBER

Sundays:	6th	13th	20th	27th
Brockwell Park ... 3 p.m.	Walker	Reginald	Ambridge	Banks
Queens Road, Bayswater ... 8 p.m.	Reginald	Ambridge	Banks	Walker
Clapham Common ... 3 p.m.	Ambridge	Banks	Walker	Reginald
Regents Park ... 11.30 a.m.	Turner	Robins	Lestor	Wilmot
Finsbury Park ... 3 p.m.	Turner	Rubin	Wilmot	Godfrey
Ridley Road, Dalston ... 8 p.m.	Cash	Lestor	Berry, V.	Callis
Whipps Cross ... 7.30 p.m.	Wilmot	Berry, V.	Cash	Hayden
Cock Hotel ... 8 p.m.	Rubin	Cash	Robins	Lestor
Victoria Park ... 3 p.m.	Lestor	Turner	Goldberg	Cash
Southend Sea Front ... 7 p.m.	—	—	—	—
Saturdays:	Wednesdays:	Thursdays:		
London Rd., Wembley (nr. L.M.S. Stn.), High Rd. ... 8 p.m.	Deanery Road, Water Lane, Stratford ... 8 p.m.	Ridley Road, Dalston, E.8. ... 8 p.m.		
Jolly Butchers Hill ... 8 p.m.	Highbury Corner, N.5 ... 8 p.m.	"Salmon and Ball," Bethnal Green, E. ... 8 p.m.		
Ilford Station ... 8 p.m.	Hackney Town Hall ... 8 p.m.			
Essex Place, Chiswick ... 8 p.m.	Avenue Road, Clock Tower, Lewisham ... 8 p.m.			
Roper Street, High Street, Eltham ... 8 p.m.				
West Green Corner ... 8 p.m.				
Becontree Station (near Park Gates) ... 8 p.m.				
Mondays:				
Ridley Road, Dalston, E.8 ... 8 p.m.				

BRANCH DIRECTORY

BATTERSEA.—Sec., 2, Hanbury Road, S.W.11. Branch meets Thursday, 8.30 p.m., at The Waiting Room, Latchmere Baths, entrance in Burns Road.

BIRMINGHAM.—Sec., E. Jesper, 38, Rollason Road, Erdington. Branch meets Jeans Café, Newton Street. First Wednesday in month at 8 p.m.

BLOOMSBURY.—Branch meets every Monday at 7.30 p.m., at A.E.U. Hall, 39, Doughty Street, W.C. (Near Grays Inn, Road.) Sec., S.P.G.B., 39, Doughty Street, W.C.1.

CENTRAL.—Membership obtained only through the Ex. Committee. Applications to General Sec.

CHISWICK.—Branch meets Fridays, 8 p.m., over Restaurant, 452 High Road, Chiswick, W.4. Communications to Sec., C. Curtis, 52, Parkstead Road, Putney, S.W.15.

DAGENHAM.—Branch meets alternate Wednesdays, from Sept. 4th, over "Ralphs Cafe," 7 Broadway, Chadwell Heath. Discussion after business. Lectures alternate Wednesdays from Sept. 11th. Communications to Sec. 5, Cannington Road, Dagenham, or P. Golding, "Besra," Boscombe Avenue, Hornchurch.

ECOLE.—Branch meets 1st and 3rd Mondays in month at Railway Temperance Room, Four Bridges, Wellington Road, 8 p.m. Discussion after Branch business. Non-members invited. Secretary, Mrs. F. Lea, 5, Gaskell Road, Eccles.

EDINBURGH.—Communications to Sec., D. Lamond, at 15, Barclay Place.

GLASGOW.—Branch meets every Tuesday at 7.30 p.m. at McLean Memorial Hall, Salt Market, Glasgow. Communications to J. Higgins, 18, Balgair Street, Glasgow.

HACKNEY.—Branch meets Friday, 7.30 p.m., at Old Grave Pit Hall, Vallette Street, E.9. Lecture after each meeting. Communication to Sec., E. Chalkley, 21, Bridge Street, E.9.

HAMILTON.—Branch meets every 2nd and 4th Wednesdays of the month in McIntyre's Hall, 151, Lowwaters, at 7 p.m. Communications to T. Jones, 47, Hillside Crescent, Hamilton.

ILFORD.—Branch meets Mondays at 8 p.m. at 142, Richmond Road. Discussion after Branch business. Communications to Sec., at above address.

ISLINGTON.—All communications to F. W., 92, Wellington Road, Holloway, N.7. Branch meets on Fridays at 8 to 10.30 p.m., at Room 4, Co-operative Hall, 129, Seven Sisters Road, N.

LEYTON.—Communications to Sec., Dick Jacobs, 12, Clifford Rd., Walthamstow, E.17. Branch meets Thursday, 8 p.m., at Trades Hall, Grove House, High Road, Leyton.

LEWISHAM.—Branch meets Thursdays, at 8 p.m., at The Anchor Club Room, Lewisham Road. Sec. N. Taylor, 5, Hawke Road, Upper Norwood, S.E.19.

MANCHESTER.—Branch meets 2nd and 4th Mondays each month, at 8 p.m., at Craigwell Restaurant, Peter Street (entrance in South Street). Public invited. Sec., B. A. Lee, 19, Emery Avenue, Chorlton, Manchester.

PADDINGTON.—Branch meeting held on 2nd Friday each month, at 8 p.m., in the guild room over "Co-op. Stores," 447, Harrow Road, W.10. Literature Sec., W. Veal, 73, Wornington Road, W.10. Discussion on 4th Friday.

SHEFFIELD.—Sec., B. Osborne, 8, Fowler Terrace, Sheffield, 3. Branch meets alternate Mondays, 7.30 p.m. at Room 2, A.E.U. Institute, Stanley Street. Meeting on 7th October.

SOUTHEND-ON-SEA.—Branch meets on first and third Wednesday at 8 p.m., at 6, Hermitage Road, Westcliff. Discussion after branch business. Non-members invited. Communications to Sec., at above address.

SOUTHWARK.—Branch meets Fridays at 8 p.m., 42, Great Dover St., S.E.1. Communications to Sec., at above address.

STEPNEY.—Sec., H. Solley, 28, Gore Road, Victoria Park, E.9. Branch meets on Fridays, at 8 p.m., at Working Lads Institute (nr. Whitechapel Station).

TOOTING.—Branch meets 1st Sunday in the month, at 12 o'clock noon. All communications to H. E. Hutchins, Sec., 174, Haydens Road, S. Wimbledon, S.W.19.

TOTTENHAM.—Branch meets 1st and 3rd Fridays in the month, 7, Bruce Grove, Room 2. Discussion after branch business. Public invited. Communications to C. Godfrey, 49, Napier Road, Tottenham, N.17.

WEST HAM.—Sec., P. Hallard, 22, Colegrave Road, Stratford, E. Branch meets Whitehall Schools, Parliament Place, Forest Gate, every Thursday at 8 p.m.

WEMBLEY.—Communications to Mrs. J. Groves, 24, Charterhouse Avenue, Wembley.

WOOD GREEN.—Communications to Sec. at 44, Boreham Road, Wood Green, N.22. Branch meets 2nd and 4th Wednesday in month at 8.30 p.m., Stirling House, Stuart Crescent.

THE SOCIALIST STANDARD

The Official Organ of **THE SOCIALIST PARTY** of Great Britain.

*Capital asks
for your
votes and
gives you
poverty and
promises, . .
bloody . . .
battlefields
and
cenotaphs*

No 375. Vol. 31]

London, November, 1935

[Monthly, Twopence

General Election, November, 1935

NATIONAL CONSERVATIVE .	
NATIONAL LIBERAL .	
NATIONAL LABOUR .	
LIBERAL .	
LABOUR	
OTHERS	

ONCE more the propertied class, through their instruments, the "National Parties" (Tory, Liberal and National Labour), are calling upon the workers of this country to return to power a Government pledged to maintain the private ownership and control of the means of life and the social system based thereon which is known as capitalism.

Once more the National Government is being challenged by the Labour Party, not upon the

vital issue of Socialism and capitalism, but on a number of reforms and proposals which, even if applied in full, would leave unchanged the basis of the capitalist system from which springs poverty, unemployment, insecurity and war. The aim of the Labour Party programme is to improve the conditions of the workers without destroying the private ownership of the means of wealth production and distribution (land, factories, railways, etc.) and without transforming them into the common property of the whole community under democratic control.

The only solution for the problems of the working class is Socialism. This is the urgent question of the day. In this country only the *Socialist Party of Great Britain* is organised and carried on solely for the direct, unceasing fight for Socialism. Only the S.P.G.B. is deserving of the support of the working class.

Owing to the meagre support so far given by the workers to the party of Socialism and owing to the £150 deposit legally imposed in respect of each candidature (which operates in the interests of the wealthier parties), the S.P.G.B. is unable to

put forward candidates at this Parliamentary election.

If the S.P.G.B. were willing to sacrifice its Socialist principles and independence by soliciting support and votes on a programme of reforms, it would at once be able to overcome the obstacle. It would be able, like the so-called "Labour" parties, to gain a large membership and apparent strength. That growth would not, however, help forward the Socialist movement, which can only progress to the extent that it gains the understanding and support of convinced Socialists. The S.P.G.B. therefore does not solicit the votes of non-Socialists, whatever the nature of the reform measures in which they may be interested. The S.P.G.B. receives the support of Socialists alone.

To prevent the enemies and false friends of Socialism from interpreting the failure to run candidates as evidence that Socialist propaganda is not making headway, Socialists can mark their ballot paper with the word "Socialism," thus demonstrating the growing strength of the Socialist vote in this country.

The Executive Committee of the Socialist Party of Great Britain, October 22nd, 1935.

Some Election Facts and Figures

THE VOTES AT THE OCTOBER, 1931, GENERAL ELECTION			
Conservative	11,926,537	Labour	6,648,023
Liberal	1,405,102	Ind. Liberal	106,106
Lib. Nat.	809,102	New Party	36,377
Nat. Labour	343,353	Communist	74,824
National	55,309		

Total Govern- ment vote	Total Oppo- sition vote
14,539,403	6,865,330

With 254,671 votes given to Independent Candidates, the total vote was 21,659,404.

PERCENTAGE OF VOTES GIVEN TO EACH PARTY AT 1931 ELECTION.			
Conservatives	54.9%	of Total Vote cast.	
Liberal & Liberal Nat.	10.2%	"	"
Labour Party	30.7%	"	"
Others	4.2%	"	"

STATE OF PARTIES, AUGUST, 1935.

	M.P.s.
Conservatives	460
Liberals	71
National Labour	13
Labour	60
I.L.P.	3
National	3
Independent	5
Total M.P.s	615

PERCENTAGE OF ELECTORS WHO VOTED. (The electors in constituencies in which the candidate was returned unopposed are ignored.)			
1918	58.9%	1924	80.6%
1922	75.4%	1929	79.5%
1923	74.1%	1931	79.8%

RISE AND FALL OF LABOUR PARTY VOTE.		
	Labour M.P.s.	Labour Vote.
1900	2	62,698
1906	29	323,195
1910 (Jan.)	40	505,690
1910 (Dec.)	42	370,802
1918	57	2,244,945
1922	142	4,236,733
1923	191	4,348,379
1924	151	5,487,620
1929	287	8,362,594
1931	46	6,330,669

GROWTH OF THE ELECTORATE.	
1832	1,000,000 (1 in 24 of population).
1867	2,500,000 (1 in 12 of population).
1884	5,000,000 (1 in 7 of population).
1918	21,000,000 (nearly 1 in 2 of population).
1929	29,000,000 (over 1 in 2 of population).
1935	About 31,000,000 (about two-thirds of population).

The War Threat and the General Election

WHAT WE SAID IN 1914: WHAT WE SAY TODAY

"Having no quarrel with the working class of any country. . . ."

THE General Election is being held in the midst of an international situation of great tension. Pleading that they cannot afford to pay higher wages and cannot afford to build decent houses for the workers to live in, the capitalist governments of all nations are prepared to pour out money like water amassing instruments for the destruction of human life in war. The "National" Parties and the Labour Party are seeking a mandate from the electors for some kind of support of the League of Nations as a means to avoid or restrict war or as a means to intimidate the Government of Italy. It is not in the interest of the working class or of Socialism to support either of these policies. The causes of war are just the same as they were in 1914. A war waged under League of Nations auspices would bring the same bitter disillusionment to the workers of all countries. The League is controlled by the agents of the capitalist class in the various countries. Divided in war, they are united in hostility to Socialism, which alone can remove the conflict of interests which causes war. Whether war is waged by separate governments on their own account or by the group which dominates the League of Nations, whether the capitalists settle their thieves' quarrels by appeals to arms or by financial and economic pressure through the machinery of the League, it is for the workers of all the world to recognise their mutual interest as members of an exploited class, their mutual interest in overthrowing capitalism and establishing Socialism. It is the duty of the workers to dissociate themselves from the actions and policies of their capitalist governments and the political parties which support those governments, and to take their stand as internationalists on the basis of the common interest of the working class the world over.

The present crisis is a fitting occasion to reprint word for word the historic manifesto issued by the S.P.G.B. on the outbreak of the Great War in 1914. It served throughout those years of war and serves still as a beacon for the workers of all lands:—

"The War, and the Socialist Position"

"WHEREAS the capitalists of Europe have quarrelled over the question of the control of trade routes and the world's markets, and are endeavouring to exploit the political ignorance and blind passions of the working class of their respective countries in order to induce the said workers to take up arms in what is solely their masters' quarrel, and

"WHEREAS further, the pseudo-Socialists and labour 'leaders' of this country, in common with their fellows on the Continent, have again betrayed the working-class position, either through their ignorance of it, their cowardice, or worse, and are

assisting the master class in utilising this thieves' quarrel to confuse the minds of the workers and turn their attention from the Class Struggle

"THE SOCIALIST PARTY of Great Britain seizes the opportunity of re-affirming the Socialist position, which is as follows:

"That Society as at present constituted is based upon the ownership of the means of living by the capitalist or master class, and the consequent enslavement of the working class, by whose labour alone wealth is produced.

"That in Society, therefore, there is an antagonism of interests, manifesting itself as a CLASS WAR, between those who possess but do not produce and those who produce but do not possess.

"That the machinery of government, including the armed forces of the nation, exists only to conserve the monopoly by the capitalist class of the wealth taken from the workers.

"These armed forces, therefore, will only be set in motion to further the interests of the class who control them—the master class—and as the workers' interests are not bound up in the struggle for markets wherein their masters may dispose of the wealth they have stolen from them (the workers), but in the struggle to end the system under which they are robbed, they are not concerned with the present European struggle, which is already known as the 'BUSINESS' war, for it is their masters' interests which are involved, and not their own.

"THE SOCIALIST PARTY of Great Britain pledges itself to keep the issue clear by expounding the CLASS STRUGGLE, and whilst placing on record its abhorrence of this latest manifestation of the callous, sordid, and mercenary nature of the international capitalist class, and declaring that no interests are at stake justifying the shedding of a single drop of working-class blood, enters its emphatic protest against the brutal and bloody butchery of our brothers of this and other lands who are being used as food for cannon abroad while suffering and starvation are the lot of their fellows at home.

"Having no quarrel with the working class of any country, we extend to our fellow workers of all lands the expression of our goodwill and Socialist fraternity, and pledge ourselves to work for the overthrow of capitalism and the triumph of Socialism.

"THE WORLD FOR THE WORKERS!"

"THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE.

"August 25th, 1914.

"Wage Workers of the World Unite! You have nothing to lose but your chains, you have a world to win!—Marx."

Labour's Way to Disaster

"Labour's Way to Plan Prosperity," David Grenfell, M.P. (Methuen, 2s. 6d.)

THE above is another of the series of superficial little books edited by the present leader of the Labour Party, which are, apparently, designed to show how little practical difference there is between the programme of that Party and that of the more "progressive" section of its opponents, *i.e.*, the Liberals. Mr. Grenfell uses Socialist phrases in a loose way to criticise capitalism, but proposes nothing to which even a normally intelligent Conservative is liable to object, in principle.

"Under capitalism," we are told on page 18, "labour is hired to be exploited and to yield the maximum productive results at the minimum cost."

"The wealth of the nations is owned by a few. Ninety per cent. of the private wealth belongs to ten per cent. of the population. Only one in ten of adult Britishers has any substantial stake in the country."

In a phrase, capitalism spells poverty for the wealth producers, yet Mr. Grenfell spends the greater part of his book tilting against the secondary features of the system, such as the wastefulness of competition. He preaches efficiency and organisation without appearing to realise that these will only tighten the workers' bonds unless the basic fact of ownership is changed. True, the author does profess to deal with this—as usual—in "Labour's way." Let us see how he does it.

In chapter vii he describes the functions of a proposed National Planning Council, which is to have general control of special Boards to be set up for each of several industries of prime importance. "Taking the coal industry as an example, it may be decided that coal owners should receive compensation at present market value for their holdings. Valuations are being made for death duties and are available as a guide to the transfer values. There are no insuperable difficulties in connexion with the transfer of mines, agricultural land, iron and steel concerns, transport, or similar terms. No new capital would be required. Present holders of shares would become bondholders of the unified enterprises under the new Management Boards and would be given an agreed rate of interest for the duration of the bonds" (p. 60). Thus the capitalists would continue to draw incomes for idleness through "national boards" instead of joint stock companies. What a difference a name makes to some people!

Need any capitalist seriously oppose such a measure? Let Mr. Grenfell answer. On page 65 he tells us, with delightful candour, that "The private owner has been relegated to a position of complete detachment from the industry, and as a

free and independent citizen *may or may not* (italics mine) desire to be associated with the management as a salaried official." He may take it or leave it, being assured in any case of his comfortable and "independent" livelihood. Our author does not tell us if the workers are to enjoy similar freedom.

Are they to be equally assured, even of, say, £3 per week, irrespective of whether they do or do not desire to be associated with the "hands" as wage-receivers in the task of production? It seems a trifle neglectful on the part of Mr. Grenfell not to have anticipated our curiosity on this point.

He evidently has great confidence in the ability of this sort of economic camouflage to remove the conflict between capital and labour. On page 51, for instance, he tells us that "Experience has shown that the common ownership of municipal enterprises, for example, has led to happier personal relations and a greater appreciation of the claims of the workers without sacrifice of efficiency." Tramwaymen and 'busmen who have had occasion to be called on the carpet by the General Manager will no doubt understand this; while just how much the municipal enterprises are common property may be gauged by a further remark of the author's, on page 55. Speaking of the "derelict areas," so-called, he says: "Local rates absorb the income from property and destroy the capital value of houses, shops, and all other buildings."

It is common knowledge that the profit derived from municipal enterprises goes either in the payment of interest on the city's debts, or in relief of rates. In either case it is the property-owners who gain. The workers do not share in these profits, which are derived from the exploitation of those employed in the enterprises concerned. State-exploited slaves remain slaves, no matter with what honeyed phrases their ears may be enchanted.

Mr. Grenfell has entirely failed to show any reason whatsoever for which the workers should support the Labour Party. The workers may in this way learn many lessons by painful experience, but they will have to find another road to their emancipation. E. B.

BLOOMSBURY

Lectures are given each Monday at 8.30 p.m. at the A.E.U. Hall, 39, Doughty Street, (corner of Guildford Street), W.C.1.

Nov. 4 (Open Discussion)

"The Party Programmes in the Election" E. HARDY

Nov. 11 (Open Discussion)

"Are Peace Movements Useful to the Working Class?" GILMAC

Nov. 18 "The Struggle for the World's Resources" S. STEWART

Nov. 25 "Russian Music, Past and Present" MOSES BARITZ

All invited. Admission free. Questions and Discussion.

The Labour Party Conference

THE Labour Party Conference was held this year at Brighton. For many reasons it was outstanding. The imminence of a general election gave it a cautious tone. The memory of two Labour Governments served to remind delegates and leaders that economic and political problems do not vanish as before the wave of a magician's wand when a Labour Government is elected. This robbed them of some of the cocksureness of former years. Promises of what they would do if and when they were elected were not so lavish. Delegates seemed to sense their limitations. Mr. George Lansbury, for years, had talked of "classless society" and "the brotherhood of man" in a way which implied these things to be Labour Party objects. He still talked of "classless society" and the "brotherhood of man," but only as an "ultimate goal." The irrefutable fact has apparently penetrated his mind that whatever else these objects are they are not Labour Party policy, and that Labour Party policy does not go beyond the immediate one of administering capitalism.

Mr. Lansbury is perhaps typical of many thousands of members and followers of the Labour Party. It is to be hoped that events have had the effect of similarly dispelling their illusions. In seeking to get the votes of the workers the Labour Party resorts to the electioneering trickery of the other capitalist parties. Unemployment and other evils which are part and parcel of capitalism are attributed to the *policy* of the party in power, completely ignoring the fact that no remedy for these evils was produced when a Labour Government itself was in power. This, however, was forgotten when Conference made comparisons between Labour Governments and the present Government. The "National" Government was described as a fraud, but no mention was made that many present leaders of the Labour Party were alleged to have been prepared to join it when it was formed if the trade unions had not threatened to withdraw financial support from the Labour Party.

The Question of Sanctions Against Italy

There was one question—the Italian dispute with Abyssinia—which dominated Conference, took up most of its time and caused other matters to be treated as routine questions. A resolution demanding that sanctions be applied against Italy was carried by the enormous majority of twenty to one. No effort was made to conceal the fact that sanctions might lead to war. In winding up the debate on the resolution, Mr. Morrison said: "The economic and financial sanctions may well be effective. But do not let us delude ourselves with that belief. If they are not effective, I am not going to say that military sanctions are to be ruled out when it may weaken the power for peace" (*Daily Herald*, October 3rd).

Mr. Morrison, however, did not explain how military sanctions could strengthen peace. He did not, because he could not. To send British and other armies to Abyssinia to drive out the Italian army is not peace, but war. Nor did Mr. Morrison explain how war would serve working-class interests. He did not, because he could not. If war is the outcome of the present capitalist quarrel it will be because of the competitive basis of capitalist society. The Labour Party has apparently learned little since 1914. If there is any difference at all between their position in 1914 and now it is that their support of capitalist interests, and willingness to send workers to the shambles, is more shameless now than it was then.

It is not surprising in view of his demand for sanctions, including, if need be, military sanctions or war, that Mr. Morrison obtained the withdrawal of the resolution which came next on the agenda. It ran:—

This conference declares its hostility to the proposals for instituting civilian air-raid drill, and considers these proposals not only futile as a means of protection against aerial attack, but a definite attempt to arouse public feeling in favour of the Government's arms policy.

This conference therefore instructs the National Council of Labour to draw up plans immediately for organising public resistance to compulsory air-raid drill, and recommends all Labour controlled authorities to refuse to operate the Government's plans in any way.—(*Daily Herald*, October 4th.)

That piece of simple-mindedness, or electioneering tactics, was obviously on the agenda before the present crisis developed.

The open discussion in the Press of the sanctions being applied against Italy, together with the present dangerous international situation, has produced some strange results. Many who imagined that sanctions were a guarantee of peace, suddenly had brought home to them that they might lead to war. It may be crediting Mr. Lansbury with ingenuousness to say that he shared this illusion, but it appears that that was the case. Indeed, how else could his change of mind be explained. Sir Stafford Cripps, who was not under this illusion, and demanded that sanctions be applied to Japan when that country invaded China, changed his mind when the question was nearer home and when the possibility of the Labour Party, as the Government, having to apply them was less remote than then. Perhaps the most ardent sabre-rattlers were those who suggested that Fascism was the real enemy.

The present support by the Labour Party of the League of Nations is the logical result of its policy since the last war. To go back on this policy now would, they think, mean a loss of political prestige, and consequently of votes.

H. W.

Politician's Parade

THE EXCHANGING OF FLAGS

The average unreflecting voter who looks at each General Election as an isolated event is apt to regard it as an occasion when his woes and grievances are brought to the notice of the powers that be, preparatory to their being dealt with: satisfactorily if his Party gains a majority, less satisfactory if the verdict goes the other way. It is a great pity he cannot sit back and take a bird's-eye view of elections as a whole, right from the day when was first inaugurated the practice of formally asking the workers for their votes.

The Liberal Ghost Walks again

He would find, like a voice from the dead, that the Liberal party is still chattering of "free trade," liberty, unemployment, and peace—just like old times. He would also find that when the Liberals had a great majority in the Parliaments of 1906–1918 that they did not do anything about unemployment, that "free trade" left the workers just as poor and insecure as they were before and are now under tariffs, that adherence to the principles of liberty did not deter Liberals from numerous war-time repressive measures and conscription, and that while preaching peace they were preparing for war, entering into secret compacts, drawing up secret treaties for dividing the spoils of war, and so on.

The Labour Party heirs of the Liberal Party

A glance at the manifestos of the Liberal and Labour Parties shows a number of interesting points they have in common—support of the League, removal of the Means Test, defence of democracy, etc. This is only natural since the Labour Party are the heirs of pre-war Liberalism. Two discrepancies between their programmes have a certain interest. Before the war the Labour Party's excuse for backing the Liberals was that it was of "immediate" importance to abolish the House of Lords, and that the Liberals would do this. The other major point they had in common was "free trade."

Now that the National Government, assisted by prominent Liberals, has abolished "free trade" and the Liberals are promising to restore it, the Labour Party criticises tariffs but carefully refrains in its manifesto from promising to restore "free trade." The Liberal press was quick to chide the Labour Party about this. On the other hand, while Snowden in his Labour Party days was foremost in stressing the need to abolish the Lords (of which he is now one), he is broadcasting for the Liberals at this election, although their manifesto is silent on the question. In the meantime his former Labour associates have dug up the bones of this once splendid vote-catcher for further exhibition.

At this election Liberal and Labour headquarters have made no electoral pact, as the Labour Party did with Lloyd George in 1931, but they have found a very tolerable substitute. The non-conformist associates of Mr. Lloyd George are running the "National Council for Peace and Reconstruction," and Sir Herbert Samuel has advised Liberals, where there is no Liberal candidate, to vote for candidates who answer satisfactorily the questionnaire of the Council. As it will be Liberal and Labour candidates rather than Tories who accept the standpoint of the Council, and as large numbers of prominent men in these two parties are actively supporting it, the consequence is bound to be, as the *Liberal News-Chronicle* points out, that numbers of Liberal votes will go to the Labour Party.

No More Reforms?

It would be a pity not to recall one prophecy of the last election which the prophets are trying to forget. The Labour Party, the I.L.P., and the Communists all declared in the 1931 crisis that the era of reforms was finished. Capitalism could never afford any more reforms. The S.P.G.B. pointed out the absurdity of this, and foretold that in due course the game of angling for votes by rival programmes of reforms would be resumed as before. The present General Election finds the Labour Party, I.L.P., and Communists—not to mention the Liberals and Conservatives—hard at work promising more and better reforms.

Property and Patriotism

Mr. Baldwin is a fitting representative of the massed brigades of wealth and reaction known as the Conservative Party. The election programme sponsored by it is well calculated to appeal to all who have interests or who imagine they have interests bound up with the maintenance of the British Empire. These people have just had a real shock—perhaps the first of a series—in the form of a challenge to British world-power. Mussolini has had the temerity, under cover of his plans for the conquest of Abyssinia, to make gestures remarkably like directing his air armadas, his Roman legions, and his fleets of submarines towards various British strongholds in the Mediterranean. Urged to take a strong line, the National Government, on reflection, appears to have concluded that some of the strongholds seem not so strong, and that discretion is well-advised at present.

So the Conservative manifesto backs the League, for electoral as well as for international

(Continued on page 239.)

Where Mussolini learned Brutality

WE are told that public opinion all over the world is shocked at the brutality of the Italian air force in bombing defenceless native villages. It is necessary to remember that this charge is not one which can be levelled only at Mussolini. Many governments have shown themselves prepared to use methods of equal brutality—among them the British Government in its destructive bombing of hostile tribes on the frontiers of India. Although the justification put forward by the British authorities is that this bombing is required to defend Indian interests, the Indian members of the Legislative Assembly recently passed by 67 votes to 44 a motion of protest against "the bombing of innocent women and children in trans-frontier villages by the Royal Air Force." (*Manchester Guardian*, October 17th.)

What such bombing means was disclosed by the late Lord Thomson, Secretary of State for Air in the Labour Government of 1924, speaking at a meeting of the Central Asian Society on November 21st, 1924 about bombing in Transjordan.

After briefly tracing the route followed in his tour, Lord Thomson brought home to his audience the efficacy of bombing by describing the manner in which the recent Wahabi invasion of the Transjordan was crushed. The British forces consisted solely of aeroplanes sent out at the shortest possible notice, backed by armoured cars. *The effect of our air attack was appalling. Some 700 of the tribesmen were killed and the rest, seized with panic, fled into the desert, where hundreds more must have perished from thirst.* Unless some such punishment as swift and terrible as this had been inflicted, the task of restoring order would have been long drawn-out, and in the end more costly in lives and money, while the results would not have been so lasting.

Lord Thomson went on to say that it might be true that oil was the key of the Arabian riddle, though he considered that wheat-production, for some years at least, held greater possibilities. The primary necessity, however, was security. The country could best be opened up by making the process a gradual one. By using it as a link in the chain of Imperial communications, this would be achieved.

(Times, November 22nd, 1924.)

DONATIONS TO GENERAL FUND

T.E.W., 7s. 6d.; C., 6d.; D., 3d.; E.P., 3s. 6d.; N.H.D., 1s.; E.J.R., 1s. 7d.; S.B., 4s. 3d.; L.B., 2s. 2d.; E.P., 6s. 6d.; A.J.F., 7d.; Central Branch, £1; Bloomsbury, £2; West Ham, £3; F.R.S., 6d.; S.T., £1; E.T., £1; B.T., £5; S.E.T., £1; Bloomsbury Branch, £1.

DONATIONS TO NEW PREMISES FUND

Bloomsbury Branch, 5s.; Robby, 4s.; West London Branch, £1 6s.; J.E.R., 2s. 6d.; T.C., 2s.; Endee, 2s.; G.F., 2s. 6d.; Southwark Branch, 7s.; S.S.S., £1 2s.; P.F., 2s.; F.J.H., £1; Tottenham Branch, 15s.; Tooting Branch, 15s.; Battersea Branch, 2s. 6d.; N.H.D., 1s.; W.A., £1; Photo, 5s. 9d.; Bloomsbury Branch, £2; Stepney, 10s.; T.Y., 2s. 7d.; Earms, 5s.; J.C., 2s.; Wembley Branch, £1 3s.; Wood Green Branch, 9s.; S.S.S., 2s.; West Ham Branch, £3 0s. 4d.; F.R., 4s. 6d.; Battersea Branch, 4s.; J.B., 5s.; J.O., 2s. 6d.; E.H., 10s.; Tooting Branch, £1; Records, £8 16s.; M.A.S., £1; Southend Branch, 6s.; A.A.S., 5s.; W.S.P., £1; J.M.S., £1; Tottenham Branch, £1.

EDUCATIONAL CLASSES

ADMISSION FREE

At HEAD OFFICE

Sundays 4.0 p.m. to 6.0 p.m.

Nov. 10	"France to 1789"	-	-	-	REGINALD
17	"Money"	-	-	-	EVANS
24	"France, 1789 to 1935"	-	-	-	REGINALD
Dec. 1	"Capital"	-	-	-	GOLDSTEIN

AT DAGENHAM, ROMFORD AND ILFORD BRANCH

Fridays at 8.30 p.m., at Ralph's Café, 7 Broadway, Chadwell Heath.

Nov. 1	"Reformation and Puritan Revolution"	-	-	-	KOHN
8	"Industrial Revolution"	-	-	-	STEWART
15	"French Revolution"	-	-	-	ROBERTUS
22	"The Commune"	-	-	-	CASH
29	"American History"	-	-	-	SANDY

At WEST HAM BRANCH

Alternate Thursdays, at 8.30 p.m., at Whitehall Schools, Parliament Place, Forest Gate.

Nov. 7	"Merchant Capitalism"	-	-	-	L. OTWAY
21	"Industrial Revolution"	-	-	-	BRIGHTMORE
Dec. 5	"French Revolution"	-	-	-	ROBERTUS

At STEPNEY BRANCH

Alternate Fridays, 8 p.m., at Working Lads' Institute, Whitechapel Road, (opposite London Hospital).

Nov. 1	"Industrial Revolution"	-	-	-	FLOWER
15	"French Revolution"	-	-	-	REGINALD
29	"Internationals and Commune"	-	-	-	ISBITSKY

At LEWISHAM BRANCH

Alternate Thursdays, at 8.30 p.m., at The Anchor Club Room, Lewisham Road.

Nov. 14	"French Revolution"	-	-	-	STEWART
28	"The Commune"	-	-	-	KOHN

At BATTERSEA BRANCH

Alternate Thursdays, at 8.30 p.m., at Latchmere Road Baths, Small Waiting Room (Burns Road).

Nov. 14	"Industrial Revolution"	-	-	-	LAKE
28	"French Revolution"	-	-	-	ROBERTUS

At CHISWICK AND WEMBLEY BRANCH

Alternate Thursdays at 8 p.m., at 376, High Road, Chiswick (opposite Turnham Green).

Nov. 7	"Feudalism"	-	-	-	GOLDBERG
21	"Merchant Capitalism"	-	-	-	WATERS
Dec. 5	"Modern Religion"	-	-	-	REGINALD

AT MANCHESTER BRANCH

Sundays at 3.30 p.m., Craigweil Café, Peter Street (opposite Theatre Royal).

Nov. 3	"Primitive Society"	-	-	-	MARTIN
10	"Merchant Capitalism"	-	-	-	ADLER
17	"French Revolution"	-	-	-	MOSES BARITZ
24	"Origins of Religion"	-	-	-	MCKENZIE

AT SOUTHEND BRANCH

One Wednesday per month at 8.30 p.m., 6 Hermitage Road, Westcliff.

Nov. 20	"Industrial Revolution"	-	-	-	LAKE
---------	-------------------------	---	---	---	------

THE SOCIALIST STANDARD

NOVEMBER,



1935

OFFICIAL NOTICE

All communications for the Executive Committee. Subscriptions for the *SOCIALIST STANDARD*, Articles, and Correspondence submitted for insertion therein, should be addressed—The Socialist Party of Great Britain, 42, Great Dover Street, London, S.E.1, to whom Money Orders should be made payable.

The meetings of the Executive Committee are held at the Head Office, every Tuesday, at 7.30 p.m.

TERMS OF SUBSCRIPTIONS.

Twelve Months, post free	2s. 6d.
Six Months, post free	1s. 3d.

Tenth Betrayal of the Working Class 1904-1935

SINCE 1904, when the S.P.G.B. started out on its task of pointing out to the workers that there is no solution of their problems except Socialism, and that there is no way of achieving Socialism except through independent organisation in a purely Socialist Party for the conquest of the powers of Government, there have been nine General Elections. This is the tenth. Nine times the politicians have sought and obtained a mandate for continuing capitalism, modified only in this or that small detail. Nine times—indeed continuously for 31 years—the S.P.G.B. has proclaimed that it makes no essential difference what is the label or programme of the political group which takes on the administration of capitalism. Nine times the workers have placed their trust in one or other of the non-Socialist parties, and nine times their trust has been repaid with poverty and distress instead of the promised prosperity, with the blood and tears of world-war instead of peace, with disillusion and despair instead of hope and progress.

Nine times the political leaders who were successful at the polls have solemnly pledged themselves to remedy those evils which now stare us in the face more menacingly than ever before.

In 1935 as in 1906:

"Great Want in a Land of Plenty."

In 1906 Mr. Lloyd George described the condition of the workers. It is a description which fits exactly the state of affairs to-day. He said that after "tinkering for generations with reform

... the end of it all is slums, pauperism, and great want in a land of plenty." (Speech at Birmingham, October 22nd, 1906.)

Since 1906 we have had nearly 30 years more of reforms—reforms by Liberal Governments, reforms by Labour Governments, reforms by Conservative and Coalition Governments. The result is that we still have "slums, pauperism and great want in a land of plenty," and still the working class have trust in politicians who solemnly pledge themselves to abolish these things by the vain method of reform.

In 1906 Mr. Lloyd George, on behalf of the great Liberal majority, promised a solution within three years. Five years after making the promise he confessed that "to-day you have greater poverty in the aggregate in the land than you have ever had" (Cardiff, September 29th, 1911).

Another traditional promise of the Liberals was peace. After the struggle with the House of Lords, and the ensuing two elections which occurred in 1910, the Liberal Government kept their pledge of peace by landing us in the Great War!

A Land Fit for Heroes.

Re-elected in 1918 with promises to make this a land fit for heroes, Mr. Lloyd George's Coalition Government collapsed in 1922 in an economic crisis which produced the then record number of 2½ million unemployed.

The pledges of 1906 were still wholly unfulfilled.

The Government which followed, with Mr. Bonar Law as premier, was the counterpart of the crisis Government of 1931-35. It came into office pledged to secure economy, to deal with the Budget and taxation questions, and to find a remedy for the unemployment arising out of the crisis. It went out of office having solved no problems of the working class.

At the next election, in 1923, the Conservatives, under Mr. Baldwin's leadership, asked the electorate for a mandate to introduce tariffs. Failure to secure the desired mandate led to the formation of the first Labour Government in Great Britain. It ruled for a brief period during 1924 without solving any of the problems of the working class. The only change between 1906 and 1924 was that the pre-war Liberal Government, backed by Labour M.P.s., had given way to a Labour Government backed by Liberals. When that Liberal support was withdrawn, the short-lived Labour Government collapsed, leaving capitalism just as they found it.

Tory Social Reform, 1924-1929.

Then came five years of Tory Government, 1924-1929. The Tories were elected on a programme of promises of more and more social reforms—for the aged, the unemployed, and the sick. Their election address, under the heading "From

the Cradle to the Grave," told how the capitalist State, with fatherly benevolence, watches over the welfare of the worker from birth to death.

Throughout that period the workers remained poor, unemployment remained at about 1½ millions, and pauperism at about double the level it had been when Mr. Lloyd George, in 1906, pledged his party to deal with it.

Labour Administration of Capitalism, 1929-31

From 1929 to 1931 the second Labour Government was in power. The S.P.G.B. had predicted its inevitable failure, as it had the failure of every Government committed to the administration of capitalism. During those two years, every one of the Labour Party's beliefs was discredited and its pledges broken. Wages fell, unemployment rose to a new high record, and Labour Party rule showed itself completely unable to prevent or mitigate the rising tide of capitalist economic crisis. When the Labour Government collapsed, and its leaders betrayed it to the National Government, it had earned the contempt of millions of workers who had voted for it with high hopes only two years earlier.

"National Government," 1931-1935

The "National Government" came into being pledged to deal with the crisis which Labour rule had been unable to prevent. It was supported mainly by Tories, but was aided by Liberal and Labour groups, and had the biggest majority known in modern times. In five years it has done nothing except carry out the traditional capitalist policy

of economising during a crisis in order to allow capitalism to take its normal course of recovery from depression. The panacea offered on this occasion has been Tariffs. After a long period of

poverty under "free trade," the workers have now experienced poverty under "protection." As a result, the working class are still poor; unemployment, after two years of trade expansion, is still 2,000,000; and the international situation is more threatening than at any time since 1914!

What of the Future?

Now once more, for the tenth time during the life of the Socialist Party of Great Britain, the workers are being asked to vote into power Liberal or Tory or Labour Parties, each of which will continue, with or without minor modifications, the capitalist system of society. Again, as on each previous occasion, the sole remedy that is being offered by those who wish to modify existing arrangements is a programme of still more social reforms to add to the fruitless accumulation of reforms of the past 100 years.

Only the S.P.G.B. stands simply for the abolition of capitalism and the institution of Socialism.

The S.P.G.B. makes no Pledges

The history of General Elections is the history of new and ever more cunning methods of catching the votes of the worker by promises of reforms. It is a history of pledges made only to be broken.

The only Party which has never promised to solve the problems of the workers for them is the S.P.G.B. The S.P.G.B. does not promise to do something for you in return for your trust in us.

THE SOCIALIST PARTY OF GREAT BRITAIN

OBJECT.—The establishment of a system of society based upon the common ownership and democratic control of the means and instruments for producing and distributing wealth by and in the interest of the whole community.

DECLARATION OF PRINCIPLES

THE SOCIALIST PARTY of Great Britain HOLDS—

1. That society as at present constituted is based upon the ownership of the means of living (i.e., land, factories, railways, etc.) by the capitalist or master class, and the consequent enslavement of the working class, by whose labour alone wealth is produced.

2. That in society, therefore, there is an antagonism of interests, manifesting itself as a class struggle, between those who possess but do not produce, and those who produce but do not possess.

3. That this antagonism can be abolished only by the emancipation of the working class from the domination of the master class, by the conversion into the common property of society of the means of production and distribution, and their democratic control by the whole people.

4. That as in the order of social evolution the working class is the last class to achieve its freedom, the emancipation of the working class will involve the emancipation of all mankind without distinction of race or sex.

5. That this emancipation must be the work of the working class itself.

6. That as the machinery of government, including the armed forces of the nation, exists only to conserve the monopoly by the capitalist class of the wealth taken from the workers, the working class must organise consciously and politically for the conquest of the powers of government, national and local, in order that this machinery, including these forces, may be converted from an instrument of oppression into the agent of emancipation and the overthrow of privilege, aristocratic and plutocratic.

7. That as all political parties are but the expression of class interests, and as the interest of the working class is diametrically opposed to the interests of all sections of the master class, the party seeking working-class emancipation must be hostile to every other party.

8. THE SOCIALIST PARTY of Great Britain, therefore, enters the field of political action determined to wage war against all other political parties, whether alleged labour or avowedly capitalist, and calls upon the members of the working class of this country to muster under its banner to the end that a speedy termination may be wrought to the system which deprives them of the fruits of their labour, and that poverty may give place to comfort, privilege to equality, and slavery to freedom.

Those agreeing with the above principles and desiring enrolment in the Party should apply for membership form to secretary of nearest branch or at Head Office.

The S.P.G.B. only assures you that your problems can be solved by you, and by you alone, just as soon as you have the knowledge, the will, and the political organisation to make your will effective. It is your task to understand Socialism, and then to join the S.P.G.B. to bring it about.

The Executive Committee of the Socialist Party of Great Britain. October 22nd, 1935.

Confessions of a Labour Leader

JOHN HODGE was the first Minister of Labour—he was also Minister of Pensions in the Coalition war-time Government. John Hodge has written his life. An enemy could have done no worse; the "Labour" leader outlook, with its smug complacency, its servility to its "betters," its bitter hostility to the workers' real interests makes "Workman's Cottage to Windsor Castle" a classic in self-revelation in that line.

The S.P.G.B. is unconcerned with personal and private characteristics of politicians, except as these react upon political action and in so far as they illustrate the real springs from whence flow such action.

Note the title of his book. Is comment necessary? Guest for "one night at Windsor Castle," "I cannot remember in my wildest dreams of future greatness an honour such as this" (p. 1). It was on this occasion that our hero tickled the Queen to death with a tale that set George looking "as much as to say 'I wonder what that tale was?'" (Tale—no, not a naughty one—on p. 190). Mary is accorded high marks for being acquainted with the Lord's Prayer: "The Queen at once observed that neither of them knew it." There ought to be a Society for the Protection of Royalty from their Kowtowers!

Hodge's first real service to his masters was in connection with a strike of the boilermakers. Excerpts from "Dora" were posted all over Liverpool, "defining penalties," and (note well that no one outside of "Labour" has at any rate owned up to espionage on the workers) "Others of my staff mixed with the strikers, giving stable tips that all the shop stewards would be apprehended and prosecuted, or probably deported" (p. 170).

The Quarrymen's Union decided against working an extra two hours. He personally bullied the men into compliance. "I have no desire to hold out any threat, but . . . those of you who refuse will have the opportunity of tasting what life at the front means" (p. 177).

Mr. Hodge, "Labour" leader, disputed with the Tory Winston Churchill over the latter's pro-

posed bonus of 5s. a week to the engineers. They got it and "my forebodings proved true. Not only did all the workmen in the engineering trades get it, but iron workers and steel workers." Worse remains behind. "Why the scavengers in every urban district got it, and retained it for many years after the War was over."

A valuable feature of this work is the Right Honourable's estimate of fellow "Labour" leaders. Henderson, with his "smug look of superiority" (p. 172); Burns' "weakness for display"; Pollit (who was "star" speaker for Hodge in 1922. Communist rank and file please note) "endeavouring to crown himself with glory . . . unfair and discourteous."

While bouquets are the subject, let our Labour friends note this: In 1917, at the Trade Union Congress, Ramsay MacDonald received "so great an ovation as to demonstrate . . . the great measure of love and affection the movement had for him" (p. 185). How much longer are you going to be taken in by this "love and affection" guff?

Final testimonial. "I have much reason to be proud of the nice things the employers in the Iron and Steel Trades have said of me since my retirement." . . . Meanwhile, good Mr. Apothecary, an ounce of civet. Pah! REGINALD.

ELECTION ADDRESSES

Readers are asked to send election addresses, particularly those of I.L.P. and Communist Candidates, to the Editorial Committee, 42 Great Dover Street, London, S.E.1.

DANCE AND SOCIAL

A Dance and Social will be held at the Express Dairy, Charing Cross Road (opposite Alhambra), on Saturday, December 14th. Admission 1/6. Tickets from Branch Secretaries.

MANCHESTER BRANCH

Propaganda Meetings are held each Sunday Evening at 7.30 p.m., at CRAIGWEIL CAFE, Peter Street, Manchester (opp. Theatre Royal).

Nov. 3rd	"Should we Fight?"	COM. MCKENZIE
" 10th	"Marxism"	MOSES BARITZ
" 17th	"The Comintern Fiasco"	A. E. MARTIN
" 24th	"Are we Bane?"	B. F. LEE

All invited. Admission free. Questions and Discussion

Classes are held at the same address on Sunday afternoons at 3.30 p.m. (See announcement on another page).

LEYTON

A Social will be held at 5 Upper Walthamstow Road (near Wood Street Station, L.N.E.R.), on Saturday, November 30th. Commence 8 p.m. Admission free. Dancing, singing, games, etc.

Has the I.L.P. been Born Again?

FOR many years the Independent Labour Party (I.L.P.) has been, as it were, the connecting link between the Labour Party (L.P.) and the Communist Party (C.P.), allying itself with either or both to suit its transient policies. It has never adhered to any clear-cut principles; its members, like its statements, have every now and again shown centrifugal tendencies, flying about in diverse directions without coherence or cohesion. At times its "line" has been pretty well indistinguishable from that of the C.P.; at times it has flickeringly maintained its independence; at times it has kept step with the L.P. It has helped to confuse the workers by exploring multitudinous side-issues, by tracking nearly every political red-herring that crossed its path.

To-day, however, the I.L.P. claims to have "changed all that." They say they have learnt from experience and have remoulded their Party to suit; therefore they set aside as irrelevant all criticism of their previous record. Let us then examine their present actions and statements. We shall find that they differ in no essentials from past ones. True, the I.L.P. no longer line up with the C.P. (for the moment), but are protesting against C.P. and T.U.C. support of the National Government's sanctions policy. They have that much sense. Yet they are in favour of certain sanctions, witness their "No arms for Italy" streamer displayed in two-foot lettering at their Abyssinia meeting at Memorial Hall on September 26th. As the National Government has since agreed to sanctions action denying arms to Italy, the I.L.P., too, has walked into the trap, and now finds itself supporting the National Government. Moreover, although anti-Communist, they are pro-Soviet—a curious anomaly; and though wary of the "poor little Abyssinia" catchword, they make use of the sister-slogan "down with Fascism."

Have they, then, any grounds for claiming that their Party is remodelled? Some, certainly; at any rate, on paper. In their new pamphlet, "What the I.L.P. Stands For," we find that the old objective of "common ownership of land and capital" has gone the way of all flesh; and that they now put forward a kind of Declaration of Principles, or "Method." The new objective is: "A classless society in which all economic resources are communally owned and controlled, the power to live by rent, profit or interest is ended, all forms of monarchical or hereditary government will be ended, and all perform work of social value according to their ability, and share in the common resources according to their need, and in which the willingness to perform work of social value is the basis of citizenship." So far so good. They have at last discovered that what they want is a Socialist com-

monwealth. But how does this definition of their object square with their yearnings towards "Socialist" Russia? The completely Socialist standpoint of "from each according to his ability, to each according to his need" is a far cry indeed from the Russian system of piece-work, or payment by deeds. A piece-work system, or anything comparable to it, is simply inconceivable under Socialism. If you deny it, read what Marx had to say about piecework. Socialists in control of the means of life could not possibly introduce such a method of organising work. Yet it was deliberately introduced in "Socialist" Russia five years ago.

The I.L.P. go on to recant their former advocacy of reforms, declaring that "working-class political organisations can fulfil their function in the class struggle only by rejecting all policies of collaboration with capitalist parties; by the abandonment of reformist policies," and that "the I.L.P. rejects methods of gradual reform, and concentrates its activities on achieving the decisive change from capitalism to Socialism." They must have been reading our Declaration of Principles! Have they then been converted to the S.P.G.B. position? I fear me no; their right hand knoweth not what their left hand doeth; they offer a solution in one breath and take it back in the next. Perpend: they wish to adopt "measures involving a definite challenge to capitalism" (why not end it instead of just challenging it?); they say, therefore, that "while the power of the movement is being developed" (a top hat for our old friend "in the meantime") they "will demand the immediate and progressive expansion of working-class purchasing power" (perhaps they are getting Major Douglas to help them in this) and will agitate for *increased wages, reduced hours, full-pay holidays, adequate housing, lower rents and increased doles*. We quite understand that they have rejected all reformist measures—they said so on page 3 of their pamphlet; so all these things obviously can't be reforms. Perhaps they are black-beetles or artichokes or something.

But this isn't the end of this shocking affair, not by any means. They claim (p. 2) that "capture of all the organs of government, national and local, is *essential*" (compare our Declaration of Principles, Clause 6); but they also (p. 2) regard such political action as "only one aspect of the general struggle," and go on to hint at the probable necessity of seizing power through armed insurrection. Such attempts to conciliate law-abiding respectable Labourites, and attract bellicose blood-and-thunder Communists with almost a single stroke of the pen merely put the I.L.P. back in their old buffer-state position, and should

cut very little ice with any level-headed worker. We endorse their first statement that capture of the powers of government is *essential* to the overthrow of capitalism, and we therefore give first place in our propaganda to the need for political understanding and political action. While recognising to the full all aspects of the class war, we reiterate that their only solution lies in the direct establishment of Socialism, and we make straight for that objective. We would advise, not only the I.L.P., but the C.P. and the Socialist League, to re-read that ancient fable, the Hare and the Tortoise.

On page 3 the I.L.P. presents a plan for "the decisive change from capitalism to Socialism." We quote it in full (our own italics):—

1. *The redistribution of the national income on the basis of economic equality.*

2. *The socialisation of the vital economic resources of the country, including banking and finance, land and agriculture, the main industries and transport.*

3. *The organisation of exports and imports under national ownership and control on the basis of a planned exchange of goods, food and raw materials.*

Each item contains a flagrant howler. First, Socialism is not concerned with "income," national or individual. This barren, mechanical idea of a mathematical redistribution of income is as old as Wyclif and John Ball—and just about as topical. The same futile misconception of Socialism was proffered by the Lassallians in the Gotha programme and manhandled by Marx in his critique of that programme. It appears also in "Labour and the Nation," which was the L.P.'s official statement of policy in 1927. The I.L.P. and the L.P. are affiliated in the spirit if not in the flesh.

Second, "Socialist banking" and "Socialist finance" seem to us on a par with crimson camels and purple pigs. Camels just aren't crimson; pigs just aren't purple; and banking and finance just aren't Socialist. They are purely phenomena of commercial society, and will disappear with that society. Socialism will abolish all forms of buying and selling. The I.L.P.'s intention to socialise economic resources now appears no more than a pious resolution; it is open to doubt whether they have any clearer conception of Socialism than the average Christian has of the Kingdom of Heaven. They are laths, painted to look like iron.

Third, Socialism does away with nationality and with exchange. We want common ownership of the *world's* resources by the *world's* workers; goods will be produced by them and distributed by them; to "exchange" goods will seem as fantastic then as walking about London in medieval armour would seem to-day. "National ownership" and "planned exchange" not only have no bearing on Socialism, but are, or have

been, actually practised in varying degrees by different capitalist countries. Whether the I.L.P. are pandering to nationalist sentiments, or whether this nationalism is simply an unsuspected relic of the schoolroom embedded in their consciousness, we cannot say. It makes no odds—in the one case they are dishonest politicians, in the other incompetent thinkers; in either case, perilous to the workers in search of a solution to their difficulties.

Later in the pamphlet (page 8) it is stated that "there are at present only two revolutionary Parties, the I.L.P. and the C.P." We challenge that statement. A political party is one having as its object the control of the state political machinery; a revolutionary political party has that object in order to revolutionise society. We claim to be the only Party to have consistently and uncompromisingly throughout the last thirty years, pressed towards that object and that alone. We are sometimes accused of supporting Fascism because we don't join in the hysterical anti-Fascist campaigns of some other Parties; yet we have invariably opposed Fascism, as we do all capitalist parties and movements. With how much greater truth may we say that the I.L.P. and C.P., by advocating reforms similar to, and even identical with those of the L.P. and Conservative Party, are objectively allying themselves with the latter parties. The I.L.P. may gush and the C.P. may bluster, but we again urge all workers to pierce through the *form* of their utterances and grasp their basic content, their true historical significance, which is not, as it seems, Socialist, but actually helpful to capitalism. Yet these two Parties announce their pliability before a reform-ravenous electorate as a "revolutionary" policy. And this condition of permanent self-contradiction is justified—nay, glorified, sanctified—by that much-abused and misused word, dialectics. Truly, man's capacity for self-deception is very nearly infinite.

Let us leave their pamphlet and turn to the spoken word at the I.L.P. Abyssinia meeting mentioned earlier. From the outset, considerable disunity was apparent among the official speakers. The African, C. L. R. James, denounced the Soviet Government in scathing terms for its "betrayal of the workers"; but Brockway spoke warmly of "Socialist Russia." The general tone of the speeches was strongly anti-Fascist, but also anti-sanctions, with leanings towards the general strike policy. A member of the S.P.G.B. asked what would be the attitude of the I.L.P. in case of war between U.S.S.R. and any other power. J. Gaster, of the I.L.P.'s Administrative Council, in reply drew himself up proudly and announced in heartfelt (and slightly reproachful) tones: "The Soviet Union is *OUR* country, and to the utmost of our power we should fight for *OUR* country." We wonder how they would explain away their position should Russia be fighting in defence of France,

whose Government is brutally capitalistic. Perhaps the "dialectic" could persuade them that one and the same shell was, in bursting, defending Socialism in Russia and attacking capitalism in Russia's ally, France, even if those two countries were fighting in common cause.

A second question was asked by an S.P.G.B. member: "Does the I.L.P. still believe in a United Front?" The answer from J. Gaster was: "Yes. The development of a united Front is a cardinal and essential point of the development of our whole policy; this does not mean suppression of individual differences, but agreement on the *immediate objective*." So apparently the ultimate aim doesn't matter after all! That whole statement flatly contradicts page 2 of the pamphlet as to the rejection of all policies of collaboration with capitalist parties. For note that Gaster was upholding not merely a United Front with the Communists, but the general theory of United Fronts. So, while abandoning all collaboration with capitalist parties, the I.L.P. consider that it is "*cardinal and essential*" for them to join forces with anyone with whom they can agree on immediate issues. Let us give Mr. Gaster (announced as having the whole weight of the Party behind his replies) the benefit

of the doubt—maybe he hasn't yet read "What the I.L.P. Stands For."

Thus, in spite of superficial improvements in wording, and valiant attempts to lay down a bedrock of principle on which to work, the I.L.P. stands exactly where it did. The basic theory of the organisation is faulty; they don't yet fully understand the nature of capitalist society, and therefore don't yet understand clearly how to end it. Hence their scatter-brained (even if sincere and well meant) policy and pronouncements.

With greater urgency than ever, in view of the approaching election, the S.P.G.B. proclaims to each and every worker that there is a way out of the mess, namely, social revolution; that it can, and will, be achieved when—and only when—the mass of the workers desire it; that they must learn to understand the world they live in, in order to transform it; that they must therein and thereby learn to sift the chaff from the wheat, the revolutionary phrasemonger from the revolutionary thinker. They must acquire political knowledge, courage and power: "Intelligence enough to conceive; courage enough to will; and power enough to compel; and then I say the thing will be done."

D. S.

THE PARTY MANIFESTOS

We give below the principal points from the Election Manifestos of the various Parties

THE LIBERAL PARTY

**Security only through Disarmament—Remove Trade Barriers
Defenders of Liberty—The Means Test.**

"Through strengthening the League of Nations, and through international disarmament, there alone, the true path to security lies."

"... the unrest in the world is due chiefly to the hard struggle of some of the great Powers to keep their peoples in proper comfort."

"All this comes from the disastrous reduction in the volume of world trade. And that is due to the restrictions imposed by Governments."

"To rid commerce of the hindrances that come from tariffs, quotas, subsidies and unstable currencies is the first step to a restored prosperity and a more tranquil world."

"The Liberal Party condemns the Means Test regulations. It considers that to treat the 'household' as a unit is wrong."

"The Liberal Party stands, as ever, for personal and political liberty. . . . It will always strenuously defend democratic institutions. . . ."

Other points in the Liberal manifesto are Proportional Representation; equal rights for women throughout the political and social system; and the need for a Liberal Party so that the only alternative to Conservative Government shall not be "a Socialist Party pledged to a reckless scheme of wholesale nationalisation."

THE LABOUR PARTY

Co-operation with the League—All-round Disarmament—Efficient Armaments—International Air Force—Public Ownership of Land and Industry—End the Means Test—Raise the School-leaving Age—Bigger Old-Age Pensions—End the House of Lords.

"The Government has helped to restart the arms race, and it failed to make Signor Mussolini understand that, if he broke the peace in Africa, Britain would join the other nations in upholding the authority of the League."

"Too late to stop the war, the Government ranged itself at the eleventh hour behind the Covenant at Geneva."

"Even now, its action has been slow and half-hearted."

"Whilst paying lip-service to the League, it is planning a vast and expensive rearmament programme, which will only stimulate similar programmes elsewhere."

"The Labour Party calls for a reversal of this suicidal foreign policy. It seeks whole-hearted co-operation with the League of Nations and with all States outside the League which desire peace."

"It stands firmly for the Collective Peace System."

"It demands speedy action, through the League, to bring the war in Africa to an end, to be followed by an immediate resumption of negotiations for all-round disarmament."

"Labour will efficiently maintain such defence forces as are necessary and consistent with our membership of the League; the best defence is not huge competitive national armaments, but the organisation of collective security against any aggressor and the agreed reduction of national armaments everywhere."

"Labour will propose to other nations the complete abolition of all national air forces, the effective international control of civil aviation and the creation of an international air police force; large reductions by international agreement in naval and military forces, and the abolition of the private manufacture of, and trade in, arms.

"A Labour Government would also seek full international co-operation in economic and industrial questions, with a view to increasing trade and raising standards of living throughout the world, and removing the economic causes of war through equitable arrangements for access to markets, for the international control of sources of supply of raw materials, and for the extension of the mandate system for colonial territories."

"At home, the Labour Party will pursue its policy of Socialist Reconstruction.

"Labour has already put before the country, boldly and clearly, schemes of public ownership for the efficient conduct, in the national interests, of banking, coal and its products, transport, electricity, iron and steel, and cotton.

"It has also declared for the public ownership of land, in order that the community should profit by its value and proper use, the reorganisation of agriculture, the introduction of unemployment insurance for farm workers, the abolition of the 'tied' cottage and the provision of cheap cottages in the countryside."

Other points in the Labour Party manifesto are:—Legislation to secure "reasonable hours and conditions of employment," trade union legislation, removal of the "unjust and penal tax" on the co-operative societies, removal of the Means Test, higher school age with adequate maintenance allowances, bigger old-age pensions and a lower qualifying age, healthy homes at reasonable rents, "power to abolish the House of Lords."

The manifesto concludes with the words: "Labour asks for a Parliamentary majority, in order to promote Socialism at home and Peace abroad."

THE INDEPENDENT LABOUR PARTY

(The I.L.P. manifesto has not been issued at the time of going to press. The following statements as to I.L.P. policy are taken from its official organ, the "New Leader," October 25th, and relate to Parliamentary and Local Government elections.)

Opposition to the Labour Party, to Military Sanctions and War, and to Rivalry in Armaments—Raise Workers Standard of Living—Abolish Means Test—Bigger Old-Age Pensions.

"Unfortunately the Labour Party will not be able to put up an effective fight against the National Government in the coming election. The Labour Party has endorsed the foreign policy of the Government. It cannot consistently oppose the increase in the armed forces which that foreign policy requires."

"We cannot have increased armaments and extended social services at the same time."

"In these circumstances, it is of the greatest importance that there should be a strong Revolutionary Socialist group in the new Parliament."

"The I.L.P. is free to advocate instead that every shilling of the available revenue shall be used to raise the standard of living of the workers. It is free to demand that the first step shall be to abolish the Means Test and to increase unemployment benefit. It is free to insist on larger old-age pensions at a lower age, and big schemes for working-class houses and for the distressed areas."

Local Government Election Programme

Points from the I.L.P.'s "strong revolutionary Socialist" programme for the Local Government elections are:—

Unemployed to be maintained by taxes instead of rates, and not to have to pay unemployment insurance, minimum rates £1 a week for single persons, 10s. for dependant adult, 5s. for each child, trade union pay and conditions for all employed on public work schemes, abolition of Means Test, Test Work, Unemployment Assistance Boards, etc., "rents within reach of workers," free meals for all school-children, "freedom to hold meetings outside Labour Exchanges."

The programme ends as follows:—

"The I.L.P., in making these demands, realises that the capitalist class will resist them. The workers must prepare to form Workers' Councils, representing their organised strength, to overcome the capitalist class. This struggle must be joined with the struggle against war, Fascism and capitalism, until workers' power is won and Socialism established."

THE COMMUNIST PARTY OF GREAT BRITAIN

Elect a Labour Government Pledged to Peace—Alliance with Russia—End the Means Test—Reconstruct the Depressed Areas—Work and Wages for all—End the Food Tariffs.

"War or Peace? These are the issues of the General Election engineered by the Tories, in order to fasten the terrible burden of a colossal re-armament programme on the people of Britain. The bigger the armaments the nearer the war."

"If this 'National' Government is returned war becomes a certainty. The only guarantee of peace is the crushing defeat of this Government and the election of a Labour Government, pledged to a policy of peace and armament reduction."

"The National Government, which held back League action during the twelve months of open Italian military preparation, is now conspiring with Mussolini for the destruction of Abyssinian independence."

"This war-makers' Government must be defeated and replaced by a Labour Government pledged to peace."

"Such a Government in Britain, fighting shoulder to shoulder with that great peace Power—the Soviet Union—would make such a mighty front for peace as to deter any and every Fascist war-making Government."

"The Communist Party calls upon all working men and women to vote down this wage-cutting Government, and to return a Labour Government pledged to improve the conditions of the masses."

"To the Polls! Determined to stop the new armaments race, to stop £200 million being spent on bombers and poison-gas."

"To the Polls! Determined to end the unholy alliance with Fascist Germany, and for co-operation with the Soviet Union."

"To the Polls! Determined to end the inhuman Means Test, to pull down Britain's slums, and build the millions of new houses required."

"To the Polls! Determined to end the scandal of underpaid miners and other workers, to reconstruct the depressed areas, to provide work and wages for all."

"End the food tariffs. End the unfair taxes on the Co-operatives. End the semi-starvation of millions."

"In the interests of unity, the Communist Party has withdrawn all its candidates, with the exception

of Comrades Pollitt (Rhondda East) and William Gallacher (West Fife)."

"The power of the working-class organisation rallying round itself all the middle-class, the professional workers, the intellectuals and technicians—such power is irresistible. It can elect a Labour Government and it can make sure and certain that such a Labour Government functions in the interests of peace and against capitalism."

"To-day the action of the united working-class movement can save the world from the horror of war."

"The future of humanity rests in this united action, growing stronger and more powerful day by day, and marching forward to the overthrow of capitalism and to the creation of a Socialist Soviet Britain."

"Forward in unity and brotherhood!"

"All behind a fighting Labour movement!"

"Close the ranks against the National Government of war and hunger!"

"Return a Labour Government to fight capitalism!"

"All together and victory is certain!"

THE NATIONAL GOVERNMENT'S MANIFESTO

Support for the League—Transfer of the Unemployed—Pensions for Clerks and Shopkeepers—Unemployment Insurance for Landworkers—School-leaving Age to be 15—Disarmament and More Armaments—Stability or Revolution?—Empire Trade.

"Under this leadership (i.e., the National Government) we have emerged from the depth of depression to a condition of steadily returning prosperity, and the name of Britain stands high in the councils of the world."

"The League of Nations will remain, as heretofore, the keystone of British foreign policy."

"While every effort will be made to find the maximum amount of employment in the special areas, increased attention will be given to the training and transfer of such labour as cannot be provided for locally to other places where greater opportunities will be open to them."

"On the foundations which sound financial policy has laid, new and rapid progress in social reform has again become possible."

"Accordingly the Government will, if returned, supplement the present (insurance) scheme by arrangements which will permit other men—and women, too—whether working on their own account or not, such as shopkeepers, clerks, and other black-coated workers, whose income does not exceed a certain limit, to enjoy the benefits of widows', orphans', and old-age contributory pensions on a voluntary basis."

"... raising the school-leaving age to 15, with exemption for those children who can obtain satisfactory employment."

"... we must in the course of the next few years do what is necessary to repair the gaps in our defences ... without either waste or unreasonable profit to contractors."

"The defence programme will be strictly confined to what is required to make the country and the Empire safe, and to fulfil our obligations towards the League. All the world knows that Britain will never use her forces for any aggressive purpose. And we shall not for one moment relax our efforts to attain ... a general limitation of armaments."

"... it is our intention further to promote the exchange of goods between ourselves and our partners in the Empire ..."

"The choice—Stability or Revolution? The advent to power of the Labour Opposition, pledged to a number of revolutionary measures, of which the ultimate results could not be clearly foreseen, would inevitably be followed by a collapse of confidence."

POLITICIANS' PARADE—continued from page 230.

purposes, promises bigger armaments, and makes all the usual vote-catching promises needed to attract the working-class electorate.

One remark of Mr. Baldwin's calls for special comment. In his broadcast speech on October 25th (*Daily Telegraph*, October 26th) he said: "I am not going to make any promises that I will cure unemployment. You would despise me if I did, because you know that such a promise is incapable of fulfilment."

Mr. Ramsay MacDonald signs the National Government manifesto, alongside Mr. Baldwin and Sir John Simon. At the last election Lord Snowden partnered MacDonald as National Government leaders, while in 1929 the two of them led the Labour Party. Now Lord Snowden helps to lead the Liberals and Mr. MacDonald helps to lead the Tories. It all goes to show how little really divides the three parties at the present time.

The Tin-Can Parties

The Labour Party has always been blessed with a number of active and noisy groups in uneasy and intermittent alliance with it, like fleas on a dog's back or tin cans tied to its tail. What attracts them is, of course, the funds supplied by the trade unions and by the Labour Party's wealthiest individual supporters, and the votes and the chances of jobs and political office. Periodically one or other of the groups gets exaggerated ideas of its ability to catch votes as an independent concern, and then there are disaffiliations and attempts at running opposition candidates. Pre-war Labour Party history had several such incidents, and at present the I.L.P. is going through a dis-affiliationist period. It is running about 20 candidates, most, if not all, of whom will be in opposition to Labour candidates. In so doing it has changed places with the Communists who are now strong supporters of Labour Government and of United Front with the I.L.P.!

As usual the I.L.P. candidates will fight on a reformist programme, as they know full well that they stand no chance of election otherwise. They will canvass the votes of non-Socialists by promising (like the Liberals, the Labour Party, and the Communists) to abolish the Means Test for unemployment pay, and then if elected they will proclaim it a victory for Socialism.

The Communist Party, in giving wholehearted support to the Labour Party this time, is reverting to its policy at the elections of 1923 and 1924, and rejecting the policy of open opposition as practised at the election of 1931. At the elections of 1922 and 1929 the policy was neither opposition nor support, but support conditional on certain pledges being given. (For a record of Communists electoral manoeuvres from 1920 to 1931 see *SOCIALIST STANDARD*, October, 1931.)

OUTDOOR PROPAGANDA MEETINGS—NOVEMBER

Sundays:		3rd	10th	17th	24th
Queens Road, Bayswater	8 p.m.	Reginald	Ambridge	Banks	Walker
Clapham Common	3 p.m.	Ambridge	Banks	Walker	Reginald
Regents Park	11.30 a.m.	Cash	Ginsberg	Turner	Clifford
Finsbury Park	3 p.m.	Ginsberg	Goldberg	Godfrey	Cash
Ridley Road, Dalston	8 p.m.	Walker	Cash	Callis	Berry, V.
Whipps Cross	7.30 p.m.	Goldberg	Reginald	Berry, V.	Hayden
Cock Hotel	8 p.m.	Wiltshire	Turner	Cash	Robins
Victoria Park	11.30 a.m.	Callis	Hayden	Ambridge	Goldstein
Saturdays:		Wednesdays:			
London Rd., Wembley (nr. L.M.S. Stn.), High Rd.	8 p.m.	Deanery Road, Water Lane, Stratford	8 p.m.		
Ilford Station	8 p.m.	Highbury Corner, N.5	8 p.m.		
Essex Place Square, Chiswick	8 p.m.	Hackney Town Hall	8 p.m.		
Roper Street, High Street, Eltham	8 p.m.	Avenue Road, Clock Tower, Lewisham	8 p.m.		
West Green Corner	8 p.m.	Thursdays:			
Mondays:		Ridley Road, Dalston, E.8	8 p.m.		
Ridley Road, Dalston, E.8	8 p.m.	"Salmon and Ball," Bethnal Green, E.	8 p.m.		

General Election Meetings

BATTERSEA TOWN HALL

A meeting will be held in the Lower Town Hall, Lavender Hill, S.W., on Friday, Nov. 8th, at 8 p.m.

"The Socialist Challenge to the Battersea Candidates"

Speaker - E. LAKE

Questions and Discussion. Admission free. All invited.

POPLAR TOWN HALL

A meeting will be held at Poplar Town Hall (Newby Place), on Sunday, November 10th, at 7.30 p.m.

"Socialist Party, Sanctions, and the General Election"

Speakers - S. RUBIN and C. LESTOR
Chairman - S. GOLDSTEIN

Admission free. All invited. Questions and discussion.

BETHNAL GREEN LIBRARY

A meeting will be held at Bethnal Green Library, Cambridge Road, on Friday, November 8th, at 7.30 p.m.

"Socialist Party, Sanctions, and the General Election"

Speakers - C. LESTOR and S. RUBIN
Chairman - J. KAYE

Admission free. All invited. Questions and discussion.

BROMLEY PUBLIC HALL

A meeting will be held at Bromley Public Hall, Bow Road, E. For date and subject, see handbills and local notices.

NOTICE TO NEW READERS

If you are reading THE SOCIALIST STANDARD for the first time and would like further information about the S.P.G.B., write to the General Secretary, 42 Great Dover Street, London, S.E.1.

EAST HAM BRANCH

A new branch has been formed at East Ham. Members and sympathisers in the neighbourhood are invited to get in touch with the Secretary, 44 Stirling Road, E.18.

NOTTINGHAM

"Has Russia found the way?"

A LECTURE by A. KOHN,

under the auspices of the Cosmo Debating Society

at
Lecture Theatre University College, Shakespeare St., Nottingham

SUNDAY, NOVEMBER 10th, at 2.30

Open to all. Questions and Discussion

EDUCATIONAL VISITS

1st and 3rd Saturdays each month (3 p.m., sharp).

Nov. 2nd British Museum - GILMAC
REAL RELICS

Nov. 16th S. Kensington - LESTOR
FROM STONE TO STEEL

Educational Visits continue to be well attended. Comrade Lestor attracted a big party to hear history about Westminster Abbey not given by vergers and official guides. Two hours passed quickly at South Kensington when some features of Evolution bearing on Socialism were objectively illustrated. At the Victoria and Albert Museum, Comrade Devereux interested a big party (including many non-members of the S.P.) by her brilliant illumination of odd corners of the M.C.H. from such apparently intractable objects as wooden chairs and the Great Bed of Ware.

The Organiser will be grateful for comments, criticisms, etc., from those attending Visits. REGINALD.

Result of the Election

In order to avoid needless suspense we announce now what will be the result of the election. There will be "no change"—capitalism will continue after the election as before, whichever of the parties, or groups of parties, comes to power.

THE SOCIALIST STANDARD

The Official Organ of **THE SOCIALIST PARTY** of Great Britain.

No. 376. Vol. 31]

London, December, 1935

[Monthly. Twopence

*Discover some
invention in .
machinery . .
that will make
the rich more
rich and the
poor more . .
poor, and they
will build you
a statue.
—Lord Lytton*

JUSTICE FOR THE MINERS

OUTSTANDING among the election results, admittedly disappointing in the main to the leaders of the Labour Party, are those of the mining areas, particularly those of the South Yorks. field, which embraces North Notts. and North-East Derbyshire. In spite of expressions of sympathy with the miners on the part of the Government's nominees (some of whom went down pits and came back converted to the justice of the present demand for an extra 2s. per day), the Labour members' majorities in these constituencies range from ten to thirty thousand. One outstanding exception, the Bassetlaw seat was won from the Government candidate, Malcolm MacDonald, by only a small margin. He considered he would

have held it but for a local strike.

For months past such strikes have expressed the ferment in this area, and the overwhelming majorities for strike action from every pit in the district supply eloquent testimony to the fact, that, if the four years of National Government has resulted in improved conditions, the miners have not noticed

it. In face of this the weak-kneed attitude of the miners' leaders calls for some comment.

Before taking the ballot they openly advertised their readiness to compromise their demands and suspend the vote if the owners would negotiate on national lines. As was only to be expected, their offer was treated with lofty aloofness. Their next move was to approach the Government with a request that the provisions of the Coal Mines Act, 1930, for the setting up of selling agencies, should be applied. The Government's reply was to request the coalowners to set them up by July 1st next.

The advantages of these agencies to the miners must remain a mystery. They (the miners) do not sell coal, but labour-power, and they would need to be childish indeed to assume that any reorganisation of the distributive side of the coal industry is to be undertaken for their special benefit. Capitalists who invest money in distributive undertakings accept the "risks" which such enterprises involve in order to gain a proportionate share of the gross profit, and if the colliery proprietors decide to invade this sphere it will be for the purpose of enriching themselves.

The miners' only hope of gaining their immediate demands is in being better organised in their trade unions. Even existing wage-rates are difficult to maintain in the face of the ever-increasing encroachment of the machine, and the resulting intensification of the competition for jobs. Under such circumstances delay favours the masters. They can afford to wait till next summer, and beyond. If action is to benefit the miners it must be taken swiftly. The existing epidemic of local struggles is exhausting funds to very little

ON OTHER PAGES

	Page
The Vanoculation of "Vanoc II." ...	243
Election Brevities ...	245
Marx on Piecework ...	246
To Sympathisers ...	246
Who is the Enemy? ...	248
Propaganda Paragraphs ...	250
Henderson the Peacemaker ...	251
Election Lessons for Socialists ...	253
Mine Accidents and Compensation ...	254
The Press and the Election ...	255
Meetings, Lectures, &c. ...	242, 247, 255

purpose. A month will, in any case, probably decide the issue, and the most the miners can hope for is some slight check to the downward tendency in their condition.

Even complete victory in securing the present demand cannot alter the general line of development. So far from putting a stop to the introduction of machinery it will provide an added incentive.

This being the situation, nothing is more ridiculous than for the miners' leaders to declare, as several of them have done quite recently, that they "want justice, not sympathy." One can readily understand the barrenness of mere sympathy to men and women in the plight of the miners and their wives; but will "justice" prove more fertile?

Obviously it is not legal justice that is invoked. From the standpoint of the law, all contracts or bargains are just which are arrived at mutually and voluntarily, providing nothing criminal or "contrary to public policy" is involved. The law knows nothing of wage-slavery. In its eyes the worker is a free citizen voluntarily entering into a contract with his employer. He surrenders his ability to work in exchange for a wage, and the law will, if needed, enforce the payment of the wage.

Few workers know better than the miners, however, that collective agreements, signed, sealed and delivered by parties representing both sides are more honoured in the breach than in the observance, precisely because of the ever-present fear of the sack.

Perhaps, then, it is to moral justice that the Miners' Federation officials refer. If so, we invite them to tell us where they draw the line. Is an extra 2s. per day their conception of a "just" wage? On what is this notion of a just wage founded? Between the minimum limit, below which the miners cannot exist and work, and the total wealth produced by their efforts there is a very considerable difference. Out of this the colliery proprietors draw their profits, landowners their royalties, and coaldealers and merchants get a living. These people enjoy comfort, while the miners endure misery. We can, however, rest assured that every one of these sections will resist an attack upon its income, and they will attempt to explain their resistance by saying that the attack is "unjust." This, quite irrespective of whether the miners demand an extra 2s. per day, 2s. 3d., or half-a-crown. The cry for justice is, therefore, as futile as the appeal for sympathy.

The miners, in common with the rest of the working class, need to rid their minds of self-deluding cant. Let them not imagine that they can delude their masters. In common with the rest of the workers, they have a commodity to sell, to wit, their power to produce wealth. So long as

capitalism exists they are under the necessity of struggling for the best possible price they can get. This applies whether they are inside or outside of trade unions. In this struggle mutual sympathy and support are imperative. The struggle, however, cannot end here.

Labour leaders, political and industrial, are busy trying to persuade us that the essence of capitalism is competition, and that if only industries can be controlled by national boards, paying interest on bonds to the owners, all will be well. Apart, however, from the difficulty of establishing national control of industries depending upon international conditions for their existence, this leaves the antagonism between the classes untouched. If royalties and profits are "unjust" when appropriated privately, by what miracle do they become "just" when the Government guarantees them, which is what the Labour Party proposes should be done?

The capitalist class cannot be got rid of by any scheme of nationalisation. Their existence is based upon their ownership of the national resources and the instruments fashioned by the working class for their utilisation. These means and instruments must be made the common property of the whole people, irrespective of race or sex.

The effort to establish such a system will involve the conscious co-operation of the workers of the world. Only when they are successful will they free themselves from the need to sell their energy to masters, and become able to produce freely for the common good.

In the meantime every effort at compromise on the part of the workers' leaders weakens the workers' resistance, and delivers them still more into the hands of their enemies—the master class. Unremitting hostility to those enemies on political and industrial field alike is the only policy consistent with a clear understanding of the situation. Justice as a watchword must be replaced by emancipation.

E. B.

EDUCATIONAL VISITS

First and Third Saturdays each month.

Dec. 7th. 3 p.m. Victoria and Albert Museum KERSLEY
"FROM OAR TO SCREW"

Dec. 21st. 3 p.m. Horniman Museum REGINALD
"LINKS—MISSING AND MANIFEST"

Jan. 4th. 3 p.m. British Museum LESTOR
"SAVAGERY AND BARBARISM"

Comrade Lestor interested a compact knot of members and friends on November 2nd—a powerful stimulus to induce reading (and re-reading) of Engel's "Origin of the Family." The value of Gilmac's talk at the British Museum on "Early Slave Civilisations" was fully appreciated. Comrades anxious to acquire the art of presenting technical facts in simple language, will have a further opportunity on March 21st, when the lecturer will cover similar ground at the Museum. *Verb. Sap.*

The Vanoculation of "Vanoc II"

DURING the last few years I have regularly met "Vanoc II" in the columns of the *Sunday Referee*, and alternately have I experienced sensations, both pleasurable and painful, at his writings. My interest is aroused because "Vanoc" claims to be a Marxian and one who lays emphasis upon the principle of Marxian thought known as dialectical materialism. But meeting a fellow behind the screen of cold print is, generally speaking, totally different from meeting the same chap fully materialised in person. And so it came to pass that we met at a meeting convened by the Economic Recovery Association. "Vanoc II" and Mr. W. W. Craik, who at one time was a principal of the National Council of Labour Colleges, were the chief speakers at this meeting. The means of economic recovery was the subject upon which Craik was to speak, whilst that of the present Abyssinian war was to be taken by Vanoc. In the speeches which followed, some affinity was alleged between the two questions, hence were we treated to a fully-rounded "dialectical" process of political and economic phenomena.

In outlining the case for economic recovery, Mr. Craik briefly reviewed the world's present economic situation and generally exposed many of the economic illusions of capital's agents. Little objection could be taken to the speaker's remarks up to this point, but in stating what he conceived to be the chief source of present-day troubles he successfully added to the world's catalogue of economic illusions. The interest paid to the finance capitalist, the man or groups of people who get their living by loaning money to their fellow capitalists, says Mr. Craik, forms an overwhelming burden on economic and social life, and the heaviest blow in consequence falls upon the working class. Money loaned at gigantic rates of interest has to be borne by the workers whenever they purchase goods of any kind. Further unemployment is induced by the owners of money allowing their money to lie idle because of their not getting a rate of interest demanded by them. The chief task before us, therefore, is to obliterate the finance capitalist by imposing a demurrage charge upon all not directly used for productive purposes, and eliminate the people who merely live by interest alone. Therefore did Mr. W. W. Craik fowl all that he had previously stood for in Marxian economic thought.

"Vanoc II" opened his speech by a declaration of his revolutionary "faith," about which he said he wanted no misunderstanding, but pointed out that he, to some extent, agreed with Craik's views on economic recovery in view of the fact that "half a loaf is better than none," which, of course, is a remarkable position for a revolutionary to contemplate. Surely "Vanoc" must have heard this self-same plea put in by every social

quack and reformer in the world. Nobody this side of a lunatic asylum would dispute that a half-loaf is better than none any more than they would that a quarter was better than none, or even a slice or the proverbial crust. The statement is confusionist and entirely irrelevant from the point of view of Socialist policy. The position is that we need Socialism, and the only means of our getting it is to educate and organise the working class to establish it.

Socialism cannot be brought into being by piecemeal methods any more than capitalism can be reformed out of its existence. If it were otherwise, what sense would there be in declaring oneself a revolutionary? The answer is none whatever, and "Vanoc" has indicated as much in many of his writings. Until Socialism is accomplished, all the half-loaves are capitalist bread, given by capitalists for capitalist purposes, to permit their dominance to persist. To the workers, the supreme task of their liberation from capitalist control will exist despite all the half-loaves of the social reformers.

"Vanoc" holds that the rise of the finance capitalist lies at the roots of Fascism, and marked Mussolini's rise to power. Fascism must be smashed, and for this purpose we are urged to join forces with the Conservatives or any political party. Of course, the whole business is bunkum and positively dangerous to the interests of the workers and Socialism. This was made perfectly plain to "Vanoc" in the discussion which followed. I denied first, that the abolition of the finance capitalist would in any way improve the position of the workers and secondly that the present Italo-Abyssinian war is any concern of the world's working class.

In the case of the finance capitalist "Vanoc" and Craik were reminded of the working-class situation in the early part of the 19th century. "Vanoc" has more than once made reference to that, and has made use of Engels's work on "The Condition of the Working Class in 1844." The horrible conditions portrayed by Engels in this work will convey the devastating effects of capital on the workers at a time when the finance capitalist did not assume the same social significance as he now does.

It seemed strange to have to remind two men who claim to be adherents of Marx, and, unquestionably, both have given a considerable amount of attention to Marx's writings, that the elementary teachings of Marx were contradictory of their position.

It is an old story, told and re-told by Socialists, that rent, interest, and profit are but different names given to express the various modes of capital's operations. To the working class it is mainly a matter of academic interest only as to

what becomes of the spoils of their exploitation; the important thing is the fact of exploitation.

Marx has made this fact as clear as crystal, and for the benefit of those who have neither the time nor the inclination to refer to his larger and more technical analysis in "Capital," we shall draw their attention to his small work entitled "Value, Price and Profit." Here we find the following statements set out to indicate to the workers that the holy trinity of capital may divide and sub-divide the swag stolen from the workers as they will, but the position is their business, not ours.

Says Marx: "Rent, Interest and Industrial profit are only different names for different parts of the surplus value of the commodity. . . .

"For the labourer himself it is a matter of subordinate importance whether that surplus value, the result of his surplus labour, or unpaid labour, is altogether pocketed by the employing capitalist or whether the latter is obliged to pay portions of it under the name of rent and interest to third parties. Suppose the employing capitalist to use only his own capital and to be his own landlord, then the whole surplus value would go into his pocket."

So much, therefore, about our finance capitalists. Socialists want to remove these as part of the entire capitalist system, and nothing is to be gained by our merely concentrating our attention on one aspect of capitalism alone.

And now about Mussolini and Fascism. "Vanoc" would have us engage in another blood-bath in the hopeless task of smashing Fascism. Why? Because, says "Vanoc," Socialism is a thousand times more difficult of attainment where Fascism rules. Yet, significantly enough, he holds that Hitler's Germany is a far greater menace than Fascist Italy. Then what is to be done? First smash Fascism, then Hitler Germany, and we must suppose that the decks will then be clear for action towards Socialism, that is if nothing crops up meanwhile to again urgently require attention.

The scheme is all so simple and would be delightfully good if it weren't so bad. It always seems to be taken for granted by people who argue in this way that the thing to do is to clear away one or more of the greater anomalies of capitalism and the rest of the task towards Socialism is easy. But all the facts are against the assumption. "Vanoc" was reminded of the position in 1914, which he said he remembered very well, and the cry of the labour leaders of this country on that occasion. Then, the Kaiser was the villain of the piece, he was to be beaten because he and his clique were a standing menace to every democratic idea in the world, and Socialism would be impossible if they had gained a victory. So the Kaiser went, and the workers came back to face their real enemies at home.

Then Hitler came in Germany as Mussolini had arrived in Italy. All over the world the struggle

of the workers went on as before the war of 1914.

The defeat of the Kaiser had meant nothing to those who have nothing but their labour power to sell for a living. The same thing will happen again if Mussolini and Hitler are dislodged from power unless in the meantime the workers will awaken to their class interests.

When this was pointed out to Craik and "Vanoc" the inevitable followed—the usual stock-in-trade attacks on the S.P.G.B. We were labelled "idealists" and were called mechanists and, let us breathe it softly, we are anti-dialectical. To such strange uses is the dialectical principle in Marxian philosophy often put that the phrase dialectical should read diabolical. It was not surprising to hear "Vanoc" declare "logic to be a poor guide," which, of course, is perfectly true if one will insist upon reaching conclusions based upon premises like "the flowers that bloom in the spring," that "have nothing to do with the case."

To prove that we were mechanists who refused to differentiate, Mr. Craik, supported by "Vanoc," fired a question to us in the middle of his reply, namely, would we not rather live in this country than in Germany?—surely a real teaser. We replied that we preferred to work for £4 a week in Hackney rather than £3 in Tooting, so what could they make of that. The argument on the difference between capitalist countries is sheer moonshine. Not that we deny the differences, these certainly exist all right, but they do not affect the main task of the workers, which is to remove the capitalist class from control of the means of life. And we are not under the impression that this can be accomplished in one fell swoop, as Craik suggested. The preparatory work of education and organisation is all too necessary for us to labour under so great a delusion.

If being anti-dialectical means that we refuse to square the circle of political compromise and anti-Socialist activity, we must plead guilty to the soft impeachment.

The Marxian dialectic is an exceedingly useful tool of thought when in the possession of those who desire and know the correct road to Socialism, but to those who can't or won't see, there is nothing but the dialectical "unity of opposites" to lead them into the opposite camp of sound Socialist thought and action. If "Vanoc II" continues in his dialectical whirligigs and fails to grasp our case he certainly will fulfil the "law of contradiction" and find himself classified by rising working class Socialist intelligence as "Vanoc II," who also ran.

ROBERTUS.

This Month's Quotation.

The quotation on the front page is from "Zanoni," by Lord Lytton, 1831-1892. (Chapter 4, Page 229).

Election Brevities

THERE were the usual attempts to stampede electors with last-minute scares. One of them—the Conservative warning that Socialism means the end of the Building Societies—has a certain humour. The Labour Party proclaimed that its aim is Socialism, and those of the Labour leaders who know anything about Socialism know that under Socialism there will be no need for banks, building societies, pawnbrokers, and other organisations for borrowing and lending money. But the Labour Party wanted to have it both ways. They wanted to claim that they are Socialists, but that they do not intend to introduce Socialism. So they protested indignantly against this mean accusation!

The Putney Ward of the Labour Party, which recently broke away and assured us that their aim is Socialism, not reformism, sent a telegram of support to the I.L.P. candidates, who were, of course, standing on a reform programme, as usual.

A dishonest Conservative manoeuvre was to pretend that the Labour Party fought the election in alliance with the Communists, although the Conservative speakers nowhere appear to have had any evidence that such pact had been entered into. Labour Party headquarters flatly rejected the proposal.

The Labour Party was unlucky in respect of its various splinter parties. It lost the fairly considerable I.L.P. vote in Scotland because the I.L.P. in many constituencies opposed the Labour candidates, and it lost a considerable number of timid Lib.-Lab. votes because the Communists and Stafford Cripps supported it.

During the election the miners' leaders were asking that the mines be nationalised, like the Post Office, and that miners have a minimum wage of £3 a week. The Postal workers who are already nationalised would like to hear from the miners how this helps them in getting £3 a week, for well over half of the adult Post Office workers get less than £3.

The Co-operative movement excelled itself in the pettiness of its appeal to the electors. *Reynolds's Illustrated News* (November 3rd) published an appeal which condemned the Government for the reason, among others, that the tax on Co-operative reserves cost each member 3/5 a year. Imagine Marx's slogan re-written for Co-operators, "Workers of all lands, unite. You have nothing to lose but your chains. You have 3/5 per annum, or four-fifths of a penny a week, to win!"

Mr. W. J. Brown, who failed to get returned as an Independent at East Wolverhampton this time, had the backing of Lord Snowden (*Daily Express*, November 12th). Previously he has been in the Labour Party and I.L.P., hunted with the Communists, was associated with Mosley in the formation of the New Party, but immediately dropped out, and dabbled in currency-mongering and backing a worker-industrial-capitalist alliance against the bankers.

The Labour Party said they were fighting for Socialism. Lord Snowden said they weren't (*The Times*, October 3rd). He told Liberals to vote Labour in the absence of a Liberal candidate, provided the Labour man was one of the large number who backed the Peace and Reconstruction Council. In his own old constituency (Colne Valley) he backed the Liberal against the Labour man. One of the erstwhile "revolutionaries" who went begging for the Peace and Reconstruction vote was Miss Ellen Wilkinson, one-time Communist. But she failed. They would not give it to her.

The Labour Party's headquarters election fund, most of which came in big donations from the Unions, totalled nearly £20,000 about a week before polling day (see *Daily Herald*, November 9th). The Transport Workers' Union gave £2,000.

Sir Oswald Mosley, for the British Union of Fascists, stated in a letter to *The Times* (November 7th) that his organisation is preparing for the next General Election, their motto being "Fascism next time." The intervening period is to be used for preparing their electoral machinery.

Mrs. Tennant, who fought as National Conservative candidate against Mr. Jack Jones at Silvertown, was one of the few who stood frankly for the capitalist system. Her reason is that the workers "would suffer more than anyone else" if the Labour Party's present programme were to be applied. It is interesting to see Mrs. Tennant admitting that after generations of capitalism (plus a long stretch of Labour rule on the local councils), local conditions as regards housing and unemployment are very bad. Mrs. Tennant also "admits that capitalism, to be successful, ought to be able to provide everyone with a job, and a decent job." It is surely late in the day for capitalism to be promising decent jobs for all. It has never provided that, and will not do so, however long it lasts, or by whomsoever it is administered.

Lord Allen (formerly Mr. Clifford Allen, pacifist member of the I.L.P.) supported Sir

Herbert Samuel, the leader of the opposition Liberal Party at Darwen, on the ground that he is a man of integrity and experience.

The Independent Labour Party was able to boast of one unique achievement in the election. The manifesto of the National Government was signed by one former I.L.P. leader, Mr. Ramsay MacDonald. Two others, Lord Snowden and Lord Allen, backed the Liberals. Others, including Mr. Attlee and Mr. Clynes, led the Labour Party. Sir Oswald Mosley leads the Fascists, a number of ex-I.L.P.ers are prominent in the Communist Party, and others in the Scottish Socialist Party, the Socialist League, and the Independent Socialist Party. Lastly, the small remnant round Mr. Maxton still lead the I.L.P. Another former I.L.P.er, Mr. Walton Newbold, supported Winston Churchill at Epping.

Marx on Piecwork

(Quoted from "Capital," vol. I, chapter 21, Moore and Aveling translation, Glaisher, 1912 edition.)
(All italics are ours.)

... it is self-evident that *the difference of form in the payment of wages in no way alters their essential nature*, although the one form may be more favourable to the development of capitalist production than the other. (p. 562.)

About the book of one John Watts, who praised piece-work, Marx says: "... it is a very sink of long-ago-rotten, apologetic commonplaces." (Footnote, p. 562.)

Piece-wages do not, in fact, distinctly express any relation of value. ... The price of labour-time itself is finally determined by the equation: Value of a day's labour=daily value of labour-power. Piece-wage is, therefore, only a modified form of time-wage. (pp. 563, 564.)

Piece-wages become ... *the most fruitful source of reductions of wages and capitalistic cheating.* (p. 564.)

They (i.e., piece-wages) furnish to the capitalist an exact measure for the intensity of labour. ... Piece-wages therefore lay the foundation ... of a hierarchically organised system of exploitation and oppression. ... The exploitation of the labourer by the capitalist is here effected through the exploitation of the labourer by the labourer. (pp. 564, 565.)

Given piece-wage, it is naturally the personal interest of the worker to strain his labour-power as intensely as possible; this enables the capitalist to raise more easily the normal degree of intensity of labour. It is, moreover, now the personal interest of the worker to lengthen the working day. ... The prolongation of the working day, even if the piece-wage remains constant, includes of necessity a fall in the price of the labour. (pp. 565, 566.)

Piece-work has, therefore, a tendency, while raising individual wages above the average, to lower this average itself. (p. 566.)

... *piece-work is the form of wages most in harmony with the capitalist mode of production.* (p. 567.)

The above quotations express very pungently Marx's view of piece-work, the system which for some five years now the Bolsheviks have been introducing and extending in the Soviet Union. They have done so in the name of Socialism in order to increase production. Our capitalists had the same motive, but did not need to use such a specious excuse. The S.P.G.B. affirms that not only the piece-work system, but the wages system as a whole, runs directly counter to Socialist administration, whether in Russia or anywhere else.

D. S.

To Sympathisers

WE have often seen you round our meetings and we are left wondering why you do not take your courage in both hands and come and join our ranks.

We are, of course, mindful of the fact that on these occasions our attitude is necessarily impersonal, and we wish it were possible to have a personal chin wag with you all. This is not always practicable.

May we here, therefore, address that personal appeal to you, to make yourself known to our speakers and lecturers when next you attend any of our meetings? Our speakers would be only too pleased to have a chat with you about the work in which we are engaged, and a special invitation would be given to you to attend our indoor meetings and lectures. Here you would be welcomed and afforded the opportunity of becoming more closely acquainted with our tasks. This closer contact, we are confident, would lead to your wishing to join our organisation. Remember! at every meeting we hold our speakers are hopeful of making you desirous of joining and winning your support. Naturally, they seek this reward for their efforts. Do not deny them this, therefore, but rather show your appreciation by coming forward and let them know what are your doubts and difficulties.

Remember again! your education in Socialism will really commence when you become a member of our party.

Our speakers welcome every opportunity of convincing you how you can attain to such membership.

It is your duty to face this question with sincerity and determination. The ranks of the Socialist Party are open to all who possess the courage of their convictions to help forward working-class emancipation.

If you cannot attend our meetings, write to our General Secretary, who will be pleased to give you any information you seek, or deal with any criticism which you may wish to make.

O. C. J.

An Invitation to Lord Beaverbrook

On October 28th Lord Beaverbrook, the proprietor of the *Daily Express* and other newspapers, delivered a lecture on various topics to the members of the Mile End Old Boys' Club. In the course of his remarks he stated that the only war in which the British should fight in was in defence of the British Empire, which he ambiguously styled as "ours."

A party member who happened to be present pointed out that the wealth of the British Empire was owned by a small section of the population and that, therefore, there is no reason why the dispossessed majority should defend it. Lord Beaverbrook advised our member to become one of the minority, but on being challenged that that was frivolous, he was forced to admit that he was "only chaffing," and that the proper answer would take too long for discussion at that meeting.

We would be pleased to give Lord Beaverbrook ample space to reply to our member's challenge in the columns of THE SOCIALIST STANDARD. Alternatively, perhaps he would prefer to debate with us in the columns of the *Daily Express*, where he would, no doubt, feel more at home. How about it, my Lord? A copy of this is being forwarded to his Lordship.

SCRUTATOR.

SUNDAY EVENING MEETINGS AT HEAD OFFICE

Meetings will be held at Head Office each Sunday in December, at 7.30 p.m.

December 1st. "Who is the Enemy?" E. Hardy

Other Subjects and Speakers will be announced
Admission free. Questions and Discussion. All invited.

MANCHESTER

Public Meetings, Sundays at 7.30. CRAIGWELL CAFE, PETER STREET (opp. Theatre Royal).

Sunday, Dec. 1st. "The International Situation" Chas. Lestor
" 8th. "Reform or Revolution" G. Clifford
" 15th. "War and the Working Class" J. Lea
" 22nd. "Jesus Christ or Karl Marx?" E. Boden
" 29th. "Are we Heading for Barbarism?" E. Lake
Admission free. Questions and Discussion. All invited.

POPLAR TOWN HALL

A Meeting will be held at Poplar Town Hall, on Sunday, December 8th, at 7.30 p.m.

"The Election, What Now?"

Speaker: S. CASH.

Admission Free. Questions and Discussion. All invited.

HACKNEY

Public Meetings. The Old Gravel Pit Hall, Valette Street, E.9 (Back of Pavilion Cinema, Mare Street). Every Friday at 8.30 p.m.

Date	Subject	Speaker
Dec. 6	"Social Institutions"	HATWELL
13	"Feudalism"	GOLDSTEIN
20	"Socialism and Religion"	V. BERRY
27	"Socialism and Sanctions"	W. HOWARD

Admission Free. Questions and Discussion.

EDUCATIONAL CLASSES

ADMISSION FREE

At HEAD OFFICE

Sundays 4.0 p.m. to 6.0 p.m.

Dec. 1	"Capital"	-	GOLDSTEIN
8	"History of Germany"	-	KOHN
15	"Composition of Capital"	-	GOLDBERG
22	No Lecture	-	
29	"History of the Netherlands"	-	STEWART

At BATTERSEA BRANCH

Alternate Thursdays, at 8.30 p.m., at Latchmere Road Baths, Small Waiting Room (Burns Road).

Dec. 12	"Internationals and Commune"	-	CASH
Jan. 2	"American History"	-	REGINALD

At STEPNEY BRANCH

Alternate Fridays, 8 p.m., at Working Lads' Institute, Whitechapel Road (opposite London Hospital).

Dec. 6	"Causes and Consequences of 1914 War"	-	CAMERON
20	"General Strikes"	-	CASH

At DAGENHAM BRANCH

Fridays at 8 p.m., at Ralph's Café, 7 Broadway, Chadwell Heath.

D. 6	"British Empire"	-	K. DEVEREUX
13	"General Strikes"	-	SANDY
20	"Causes and Consequences of 1914 War"	-	CAMERON
Jan. 3	"Origins of Religion"	-	STEWART

At LEWISHAM BRANCH

Alternate Thursdays, at 8 p.m., at The Anchor Club Room, Lewisham Road.

Dec. 5	"Causes and Consequences of 1914 War"	-	I. BENJAMIN
19	"General Strikes"	-	SANDY
Jan. 2	"History of Trade Unionism"	-	LAKE

At WEST HAM BRANCH

Alternate Thursdays, at 8 p.m., at Whitehall Schools, Parliament Place, Forest Gate.

Dec. 5	"French Revolution"	-	STEWART
19	"Internationals and Commune"	-	KOHN
Jan. 9	"American History"	-	WATERS

At CHISWICK BRANCH

Alternate Thursdays at 8 p.m., at 376, High Road, Chiswick (opposite Turnham Green).

Dec. 5	"Modern Religion"	-	REGINALD
19	"Industrial Revolution"	-	FLOWER
Jan. 2	"French Revolution"	-	REGINALD

Syllabuses of all lectures can be obtained from the Classes Organiser at Head Office. Complete set of last year's course 2/-, or post free 2/3. Single syllabuses, this year or last, one penny each.

THE SOCIALIST STANDARD

Fill in and post to Literature Secretary, 42, Great Dover Street, London, S.E.1, and get this paper regularly.

Please send me THE SOCIALIST STANDARD regularly for 12 months, for which I enclose 2s. 6d. (for six months, 1s. 3d.)

Name

Address

THE SOCIALIST STANDARD

DECEMBER,



1935

OFFICIAL NOTICE

All communications for the Executive Committee. Subscriptions for the *SOCIALIST STANDARD*, Articles, and Correspondence submitted for insertion therein, should be addressed—The Socialist Party of Great Britain, 42, Great Dover Street, London, S.E.1, to whom Money Orders should be made payable.

The meetings of the Executive Committee are held at the Head Office, every Tuesday, at 7.30 p.m.

TERMS OF SUBSCRIPTIONS.

Twelve Months, post free	2s. 6d.
Six Months, post free	1s. 3d.

Who is the Enemy?

THE propagandists of the S.P.G.B. are asked from time to time why their speeches and the publications of the party contain criticisms of other organisations which profess to be Socialist. Why cannot the S.P.G.B. leave the Labour Party, I.L.P. and Communist Party alone, and get on with stating the case for Socialism? Or, if it be conceded that a certain amount of comment is necessary, why must there be so much of it? Do we think that the workers' real enemies are not the capitalists and their direct agents, but the parties mentioned above?

These are legitimate questions, calling for a serious answer, if our attitude is not to be misunderstood. Let us first deal with the capitalists themselves. We can echo Marx, and admit that we do not present the capitalists, those who live by owning, in a flattering light, but we can wholeheartedly endorse his further statement, that "individuals are dealt with only in so far as they are the personifications of economic categories, embodiments of particular class-relations and class-interests." "My standpoint," said Marx, "can less than any other make the individual responsible for relations whose creature he socially remains, however much he may subjectively raise himself above them." We are attacking capitalism, and all who defend it are to that extent our political foes, but we do not regard them, therefore, as human beings different from or inferior to ourselves. We understand perfectly how their environment and economic interests mould their outlook, and influence their conduct, and prevent them in the mass from seeing the need for Socialism.

Our Appeal to the Workers

Because of this our appeal must be primarily to the workers. It is our task to throw light on the dark places of capitalism in order to interest and enlighten the workers as a preliminary to getting them to become active and understanding Socialists. In this work we expect to be opposed by the capitalist class and by their political parties and the persons and instruments they control. We expect them to oppose Socialism because to them it is merely an attack on their property, their security, their livelihood, and on all the beliefs and habits they have become accustomed to. We know that they will be the last to perceive and appreciate that Socialism is an orderly scientific adaptation of human relationships to the development of society's forces of production. We are not surprised, therefore, when the avowedly capitalist parties, Liberal and Tory, stand firmly for capitalism, and grudgingly yield small concessions only in order to lessen discontent which may appear to threaten their hold on the machinery of government. Likewise, we expect the capitalist-controlled Press, the Churches, the military men, the lawyers, and the various hangers-on of capitalism to defend capitalism. We expect this, but we must constantly expose it and explain it. That is part of our work of winning over the working class for Socialism.

Where does the Labour Party Stand?

Where do the Labour Party, the I.L.P., and the Communists stand in relation to this? Do we say that the Tories and the Labour parties are identical, and must, therefore, be treated in the same way? By no means. They are not identical, but are separated by a very real difference. The people who control and finance the Tory Party and the Liberal Party are consciously defending capitalism and their own class privilege—even if they are fortified by the erroneous belief that in so doing they are defending the best interests of humanity as well. The Labour Party, the I.L.P., and the Communist Party approach the issue from a very different angle. They are essentially parties of discontent, representing the workers' more or less blind retaliation to the downward pressure of capitalism. Where the Tories offer reforms deliberately with the idea of buying off discontent or directing it into harmless courses, the Labour Party and the other two parties are trying to encroach on capitalism by means of reforms. They hope to use discontent as the road to power, then use that power for a more or less drastic reconstitution of society. Apart from a certain amount of political dishonesty and the desire for personal advantage associated with those parties, we have no objection to the motives behind their activities. We do not charge these men with con-

sciously wanting to uphold capitalism, nor do we suppose for one moment that their activities do, in fact constitute the main defence of capitalism and main obstacle to Socialism.

The chief defence of capitalism is the State, with its armed forces, controlled by the capitalist class, their hold on it being backed up by the concentrated activities of capitalist politicians, parties, Press, and propaganda instruments. So long as they retain the confidence of the mass of workers, capitalism is impregnable.

Why, then, our criticisms of the Labour Party? We criticise because, whatever the motive may be behind the activities of that party, and the I.L.P. and Communists, the activities are harmful. It is harmful to the interests of the working class that they should organise and strive for reforms of capitalism instead of for the abolition of capitalism. It is politically dishonest and harmful to delude the workers with the notion that their problems can be remedied piecemeal while capitalism remains in being. It is harmful when workers are waking up to the nature and consequences of capitalism to turn their energies to the reform of capitalism for, with a little knowledge, honesty and patience, those energies might be turned almost as quickly to the task of abolishing capitalism.

In brief, we do not charge these parties with being capitalism's principal support, but with being obstacles in the way of working-class enlightenment. Were there no such reformist parties capitalism would still stand as long as the majority of workers remained

capitalistically-minded, but the work of making Socialists would be vastly easier. Socialists would not, having exposed capitalism, then have to take on the additional task of exposing reformism masquerading as Socialism.

Another reason for our criticism of the I.L.P. and Communists is that they sometimes advocate riots and minority armed revolt, from which nothing but disaster can come.

The above criticisms are all directed to the main activities of the reformist parties, their efforts to secure concessions from the capitalist class. When we come to look at some of the other activities our criticism is of a different kind. For the Labour Party to try to secure increased old-age pensions or the relaxation of unemployment insurance regulations is not directly harmful to working-class interests. What can be said of it is that it deals only with the effects of capitalism instead of getting at the cause—capitalism itself. But to the extent to which Labour leaders preach community of interests between workers and capitalists, supporting capitalist wars, poison the workers' minds and create working-class disunity by advocating nationalism, or use the machinery of Government to defeat strikes, then we must point out that they are, in fact, lining up with the capitalist class against the workers. That situation is bound to happen when a Labour Party takes on the work of administering capitalism. The individuals may want to do their best, but a Labour Government cannot save the workers from the consequences of capitalism, and it cannot refuse the

THE SOCIALIST PARTY OF GREAT BRITAIN

OBJECT.—The establishment of a system of society based upon the common ownership and democratic control of the means and instruments for producing and distributing wealth by and in the interest of the whole community.

DECLARATION OF PRINCIPLES

THE SOCIALIST PARTY of Great Britain HOLDS—

1. That society as at present constituted is based upon the ownership of the means of living (i.e., land, factories, railways, etc.) by the capitalist or master class, and the consequent enslavement of the working class, by whose labour alone wealth is produced.
2. That in society, therefore, there is an antagonism of interests, manifesting itself as a class struggle, between those who possess but do not produce, and those who produce but do not possess.
3. That this antagonism can be abolished only by the emancipation of the working class from the domination of the master class, by the conversion into the common property of society of the means of production and distribution, and their democratic control by the whole people.
4. That as in the order of social evolution the working class is the last class to achieve its freedom, the emancipation of the working class will involve the emancipation of all mankind without distinction of race or sex.
5. That this emancipation must be the work of the working class itself.
6. That as the machinery of government, including the armed forces of the nation, exists only to conserve the monopoly by the capitalist class of the wealth taken from the workers, the working class must organise consciously and politically for the conquest of the powers of government, national and local, in order that this machinery, including these forces, may be converted from an instrument of oppression into the agent of emancipation and the overthrow of privilege, aristocratic and plutocratic.
7. That as all political parties are but the expression of class interests, and as the interest of the working class is diametrically opposed to the interests of all sections of the master class, the party seeking working-class emancipation must be hostile to every other party.
8. THE SOCIALIST PARTY of Great Britain, therefore, enters the field of political action determined to wage war against all other political parties, whether alleged labour or avowedly capitalist, and calls upon the members of the working class of this country to muster under its banner to the end that a speedy termination may be wrought to the system which deprives them of the fruits of their labour, and that poverty may give place to comfort, privilege to equality, and slavery to freedom.

Those agreeing with the above principles and desiring enrolment in the Party should apply for membership form to secretary of nearest branch or at Head Office.

responsibility of enforcing the laws which safeguard the property of the capitalist classes.

We may sum up by saying that it is a mistake for workers to express their discontent by organising to secure reforms of capitalism, and the S.P.G.B. must constantly point out that mistake. Further, when the party of reform takes on the administration of capitalism it becomes at once a party committed to the suppression of discontent. The S.P.G.B. must point that out also, and must oppose both forms of activity.

Is it Overdone

Lastly, there is the question whether Socialists

are too much occupied with the reformist parties and too little with the avowedly capitalist ones. There may be some truth in this, but if so the reason is a simple one. It happens at present that the S.P.G.B.—possibly owing to its numerical weakness and lack of resources—comes into contact more with members of the reformist parties than with members of the Tory and Liberal parties. In consequence, party propagandists find much of their time and attention unavoidably taken up with answering the point of view of the reformist parties. That does not mean, however, that the position or importance of these parties is misunderstood or exaggerated.

Propaganda Paragraphs

Profits Before Children's Lives

The Evening News (November 9th) reports a protest by the Council of the College of Preceptors because the London Transport Board has partially withdrawn the privilege of cheap fares for school-children attending Board of Education approved schools and independent schools.

The Council points out that, in consequence of the withdrawal of the privileges, there has been a big increase in the number of children going to school on bicycles.

So the children must travel on bicycles, which everyone knows is highly dangerous under modern traffic conditions, because the London Transport Board puts dividends to shareholders before children's lives, and because the working-class parents cannot afford to pay full fares.

Here we see not only the iniquity of capitalism, but also the uselessness of trying to patch it up and refashion it. For the London Transport Board was initiated by a Labour Government, when Mr. Herbert Morrison was Minister of Transport, and completed by the National Government.

There is nothing to do with capitalism except to abolish it. Transport services will then be run for the use of the community, and lives will not be endangered for the sake of private interest.

* * *

The Crime of Being Poor The Problem of Wives Separated from their Husbands

According to *The Times* (November 9th) every year 20,000 people are sent to jail because of inability to pay fines, or keep up payments for wife or child maintenance, or pay rates. The evil has caused so much outcry that the Government is trying to lessen the number of imprisonments. Justices are empowered and advised in future to impose imprisonment less frequently. Even so, the practice is not to be abolished. As *The Times* puts

it: "For some offenders . . . who have no means to pay imprisonment may be necessary as the only alternative penalty appropriate to the offence." In other words, the rich will continue to escape jail because they have money, and the poor will still be imprisoned for the crime of poverty.

The stupid callousness of capitalism, and the futility of trying to reform it are brought home by the Government's attitude towards working-class husbands and wives in cases of maintenance. In the past husbands without means have been ordered to pay, and because they cannot pay have been sent to jail, where they are, of course, unable to earn anything at all. The wife gets nothing. The Government, after years and years of deep cogitation by highly-paid lawyers, has solved the problem. In future, such men are not to be jailed, and the Courts are to refrain from letting their sympathy with the wife lead them to order big payments from the poverty-stricken husband. So far so good. But surely the real problem is that here you have husbands and wives, living in an age when wealth production is easier than ever before, unable to find enough to keep themselves, let alone each other. But the all-wise law cannot be bothered with such trumpery things as the life and happiness of human beings, so we have *The Times* interpreting the new attitude of the Government in the following phrases:—

There is nothing the Court can do to help the woman where the man's resources have no margin beyond what is necessary for his subsistence. If he can only pay a small sum, which is insufficient for the woman's needs, that is not a reason for ordering the payment of a higher amount.

In a sane world, a Socialist world, these stupid problems will not exist. Women will not be dependent for their livelihood on men, and then we shall not need to have too-clever lawyers mocking the victims of poverty with nonsensical solutions to a problem only Socialism can solve. The relationship of men and women will cease to be poisoned by poverty or by economic dependence.

State Maintenance of Children

One of the reforms long advocated in this and other countries is the provision of free meals for the children of poor parents. Thirty or forty years ago the Social Democratic Federation and Newcastle Labour Electoral organisation were among the many advocates of such proposals. The S.D.F. asked for "free maintenance for the children in all Board schools," and the Newcastle organisation wanted "free compulsory education: Boards to have power to provide free meals for the children." It may be said that to some extent their demands have been met, for under the Education Acts local education authorities have power to provide meals. In 1933, out of 5,000,000 children at elementary schools, about 400,000 were provided with meals, and of this 400,000 about 269,000 received meals free of cost.

An alternative scheme is the system of "family allowances," that is, special payments made to parents in respect of the maintenance of dependent children. Schemes of this kind are in operation in France, Australia and several other countries.

What is the Socialist attitude towards these proposals? While we sympathise with the motive which is in the minds of some of the advocates (but not of all) of raising the workers' standard of life, that must not be allowed to blind us to the emptiness of all such schemes. We must not forget that we live under capitalism, and that the kind of child maintenance which the capitalists and their Governments will consent to introduce is not at all the kind desired by some of the more simple-minded enthusiasts who ask for this reform. Miss Eleanor Rathbone, who is a leading propagandist for family allowances, makes no secret of the fact that her intention is nothing more than to spread the poverty of the working class more evenly. She

does not intend that the workers' standard of living shall be raised by the grant of allowances. The money to be paid to the families with children is to be collected from the working class unmarried men and women. In other words, the wages of one section of the workers are to be reduced in order to pay allowances to another section.

Again, it is essential to remember that the working class depend for their living on their wages, and wages are dependent on the cost of living. If the Government relieves working-class families of the cost of feeding their children the effect would be that wages would tend to fall correspondingly. This was the result in Vienna when the Government reduced rents to a very low level. Also, under the last Labour Government in Great Britain, a committee set up by the Government recommended lower wages for wool workers because the workers are now relieved of the cost of providing for themselves during unemployment, sickness and old age. What little benefit the workers had gained through unemployment and health insurance and old age pensions was to be knocked off their wages.

That is capitalism, and while it endures all reform measures will be wrecked against the hard rocks of the capitalist basis of society.

The Socialist remedy is of quite a different character. Under Socialism, not only children, but all persons will have their necessities of life provided freely from the common stock, which it will be the task of the whole working population to produce in co-operation. It will appear, then, the height of absurdity and cruelty that in our day children should actually be punished with undernourishment and inadequate clothing and shelter for the crime of having poor parents.

H.

Henderson the Peacemaker

ON the death of Arthur Henderson, the entire daily Press mourned the loss of one, who, they claimed, was a fighter for humanity. His death, they said, was a great loss to suffering mankind. In Henderson was embodied the greatest virtues. He was an arch-apostle of peace, and the champion of the oppressed working class. Even the *Daily Worker*, mouthpiece of the Communist Party, dropped a reverent sigh, and gently remarked "that *sometimes* (our italics) Arthur Henderson had found himself in a contradictory position"—this, incidentally, after years of the bitterest abuse, in which he was called a "lick-spittle of the bourgeoisie" and "social Fascist." None of them mentioned his war record except in terms of the highest praise. We, however, consider his stand for "National honour" and his

opposition to a "premature peace" to have been a gross betrayal of the working-class interests.

On the outbreak of war, in 1914, Mr. Ramsay MacDonald, because of his opposition to the war, was forced to stand aside, and allow Arthur Henderson to assume the chairmanship of the Labour Party. Henderson was made a Privy Councillor in 1915. After this he became President of the Board of Education, 1915-16, Paymaster-General and Labour Adviser to the Government in 1916, and a member of the War Committee of the Cabinet, 1916-17. In 1916 peace moves were being made in very powerful and influential circles, and Lord Lansdowne and Mr. A. J. Balfour circulated memoranda to the Cabinet. Mr. Henderson would have none of this, for, to quote Lloyd George, he threw in the "whole weight of his great influence

with organised Labour, against a premature peace." (War Memoirs, Vol. 2.) Lloyd George says that Henderson's words are worth quoting. We agree.

The war has gone on too long for some of the people of this country. It is possible . . . that we may become war-weary, and I want to warn everyone of the *danger* (our italics) of a premature peace. I am as strong for peace as any man or woman can be, but I must be satisfied that the peace we expect places us, above any doubt, beyond the recurrence of such a catastrophe. . . . We want not a dishonourable peace, but a lasting peace, peace based upon national right and national honour, and I say these two words in spite of the fact that one of my own colleagues has described them as platitudes. (Vol. 2, page 888, War Memoirs, Lloyd George.)

Thus, Uncle Arthur.

But let us see what this "danger of a premature peace" really was. A few months before this "Peace with Honour" effort, a Major Carter had been asked to report on the conditions of the soldiers in Mesopotamia. The following is an extract from the report which was delivered to the Government of which Mr. Henderson was a member. Even Lloyd George cannot quote this report without "apologising for its repulsive horror."

"I was standing on the bridge," reports Major Carter, "in the evening when the Medjidieh arrived. She had two steel barges without any protection against the rain as far as I can remember. As this ship . . . came up to us I saw that she was absolutely packed, and the barges, too, with men. . . . When she was about 300 to 400 yards off, it looked as if it were festooned with ropes. The stench when she was close was quite definite, and I found what I mistook for ropes were dried stalactites of human faeces. . . . This is what I then saw. A certain number of men were standing and kneeling on the immediate perimeter of the ship. Then we found a mass of men huddled up anyhow—some with blankets, and some without. . . . They were covered with dysentery and dejecta from head to foot. With regard to the first man I examined. . . ." (Lloyd George omits "this still more terrible passage" of Major Carter's report. Page 820.)

Since the peace which finally came did not place us "beyond the recurrence of such a catastrophe," it is only fair to assume that the only danger attending a premature peace was the danger that horrors such as these might cease. Or perhaps there was a danger of Henderson losing his job in the War Cabinet on the arrival of a "premature peace." Mr. Henderson admitted that his words had been described by one of his colleagues as platitudes. They were worse. They were deliberate deceit, used in order to hoodwink those workers who may have been growing tired of being cannon fodder for the ruling-class.

Peace Work or Piece Work?

Lest it be thought that Mr. Henderson, by his chairmanship of the useless Disarmament Conference was atoning for his past, and was now opposed to war, it is necessary to bring evidence proving quite the contrary.

While Henderson was a member of the Labour Government British war-planes bombed and killed

700 natives of Iraq in defence of the interests of British oil magnates. Again, at the Labour Party Conference of 1925, Mr. Henderson opposed a resolution pressing for disarmament. He said:—

If France continued in the frame of mind she was now in, had they to overlook the possibilities of defence? Could they afford to ignore this question of defence. (Report of Conference proceedings, page 232.)

When the Labour Party came to office, with Mr. Henderson one of the leading members of the Cabinet (first as Home Secretary, and then as Secretary for Foreign Affairs) it maintained, and in certain cases, increased the defence forces of the country. It also began the construction of five new cruisers, in spite of the opposition of the Liberals.

In spite of his war record, and in the face of his peace record, Henderson was awarded the Nobel Peace Prize, valued normally at £5,000. His friends and relatives feared to tell him, during his last illness, of the commencement of hostilities in Abyssinia, lest the shock should prove too great. But what could have shocked him so greatly? He had once before helped in the prosecution of hostilities, and the fact that people were being blown to pieces to satisfy the ruling-class could hardly, therefore, have frightened him very much. For had he not taken part in leading the workers to the shambles of 1914? Had he not, by his stand for "national honour" and against a "premature peace," signified his willingness to make the world safe for capitalism? What, then, could have shocked him?

The career of Mr. Henderson is yet one more illustration of the dangers of leadership. It is not merely the failure or costly mistakes of an individual leader, but the uselessness of leadership itself to the Socialist movement and the working class.

KAYE AND SCRUTATOR.

A MISTAKEN NOTION

A reader (*E. Roberts, Rugby*), draws attention to the notice in the November issue asking for "election addresses, particularly those of I.L.P. and Communist Candidates," and asks if this means that the S.P.G.B. is particularly opposed to those parties, and if so, on what grounds.

The inference drawn by our correspondent is entirely baseless, and the wording of the notice has a very simple and obvious explanation. All of the I.L.P. and Communist Candidates were in constituencies outside London, and therefore our only method of getting their election addresses was through readers of *THE SOCIALIST STANDARD*. Liberal, Labour and Conservative addresses, on the other hand, were obtainable by the score in London, and we therefore had no special need to ask for provincial ones. The rest of the point raised by this correspondent is dealt with elsewhere in this issue.

ED. COMM.

Election Lessons for Socialists

AFTER half a century of continuous effort to build up more or less independent working-class political organisations, the electors of this country—of whom at least 85 per cent. are wage or salary earners or their dependants—have returned to power the Conservative Party with its allies, the small National Liberal and National Labour groups. The Labour Party, which in the public estimation holds the field as the party of the workers and of Socialism, received about 8,300,000 of the votes cast in contested constituencies, equivalent to 38 per cent., and succeeded in winning 155 seats, about 25 per cent. of the total. While the total Labour vote (in a smaller number of contested constituencies) equalled the high record reached in 1929, and thus retrieved much of the ground lost in 1931, the position of the Labour Party cannot be regarded by them with much ratification. It is evident that the bad showing made by the Labour Cabinet in 1931 is still something of a millstone round the necks of Labour candidates, and few now credit the once popular delusion that a Labour Government in office would go on from strength to strength by virtue of its solid achievement.

Between 1929 and 1935 the total electorate grew from 28,850,870 to 31,305,527, an increase of nearly 2½ millions, and the electorate in the reduced number of contested constituencies grew by upwards of 600,000. It is evident that the Labour Party has not succeeded in capturing many of the new voters, or if it has then this has been offset by the loss of former supporters who still follow MacDonald and Thomas. It is true that the percentage of votes in the contested constituencies which went to Labour candidates rose from 37 per cent. in 1929 (the previous high record) to about 38 per cent., but the proportion of electors who troubled to go to the poll at all, declined substantially. Whereas, in the past three General Elections, about 80 per cent. have voted, this time it fell to 71 per cent., the lowest in any year since 1918. The *Manchester Guardian* in a survey of the results from the Labour Party's point of view, sums up as follows:—

Taking 1929 as the standard, it would appear that the Labour poll increased mainly in two classes of constituency—the mining areas, which are Labour already (or were only temporarily deflected in 1931), and the rural and semi-rural constituencies of the south, which are the strongholds of Toryism and have large Tory majorities. In the urban industrial constituencies, both in those which Labour holds, and in those which it has still to win, 1935 was, on the whole, a much worse year than 1929. Not only has the Labour vote declined in constituencies fought under the same conditions in 1929, but it has received only slight (sometimes no) benefit from the Liberal vote released by the standing down of a Liberal candidate. (M.G., November 18th, 1935.)

That there should be increasing apathy in elections is itself a condemnation of the Labour

Party. Electors have seen Labour Government, and it has increased their indifference to politics!

The opposition Liberal vote changed little as compared with 1931, being about 1,400,000 on each occasion, but it represents a huge decline from the Liberal strength in 1929. Then, before they were split into three or four factions, they polled over 5,000,000. There seems little likelihood of a Liberal recovery, but the way the Liberals give their favours will continue to be of great importance to the rival suitors, the Labour and Conservative Parties.

The Conservative candidates, quite apart from their allies, obtained about 48 per cent. of the votes cast, thus bringing them to the level reached in 1924, and well below the high point of 1931 (54.9 per cent.). It is, however, obvious that a good deal of this vote is due to the support of the National Liberal and National Labour groups.

As some observers long ago realised, the Conservatives cannot normally expect to get even half of the votes unless they can receive the allegiance of other groups—hence their fondness for Coalitions and National Governments.

Why do Workers Vote Tory?

Why do the workers vote in such large numbers for the National Government? Traditional confidence in the party of wealth and privilege, feelings of patriotism and the uncertain international situation, these sentiments played their part, but alongside and overshadowing them was the workers' estimate of their own self-interest. They judged that more work, steady wages, and some slight additions to the body of social reform are the things that matter, and will always matter, and they believe that these are best looked after by a stable, Conservative Government. In that respect the continued trade depression, perhaps, helped the National candidates, and if the next election takes place when trade is better and the workers are more confident, they might be more inclined to turn to the Labour Party. Nevertheless, it still seems probable, as was indicated in 1931 by that election, that the Labour Party has as little chance as the Tories of getting a majority of votes on its own programme and without Liberal backing. So long as the contest is about questions of wages, social reforms and foreign policy, all of which are within the framework of capitalism, the workers are bound to be divided. Those whose immediate interests appear to be served by tariffs or armament expenditure will vote one way, and those who think they will make some small gain by free trade or more social reforms will vote the other. The only chance, therefore, of a Labour majority of votes would seem to be some situation which hopelessly discredits the party in power in the way that the Labour Party was discredited in 1931. Then the

Labour Party may get substantial Liberal support and some from disgruntled voters who formerly voted Tory.

What is the remedy? It will come through changing the face of the struggle. When Socialists can force forward the issue Socialism versus Capitalism so that it becomes the issue at elections and between elections, the workers will be on the high road to greater unity than has ever been known before.

What lessons and encouragement can Socialists draw from the election? The first is that the electorate were comparatively apathetic. In the three elections from 1924 to 1931 about 80 per cent. of the electors voted. This year it fell to 71%, and many observers commented on the lack of interest during the contest. If it means that voters are less moved by scares, and by the promises of politicians, that is a welcome change, provided that Socialists can use it to interest the workers in the fundamental problem. Otherwise, however, it may only help such people as the Fascists, who thrive on mere apathy and disgust with the older parties.

The Communists and I.L.P. candidates who opposed the Labour candidates did comparatively well, especially in Scotland, and if we consider the difficulties of fighting the party machine and the Trade Union organisation which supports it. As, to some extent, the appeal of the I.L.P. and Communist candidates was to a vague feeling that the Labour Party fails through not being Socialist, this is an encouraging feature, even though the two parties are themselves tarred with much the same

kind of brush. The I.L.P. group is increased from three M.P.s to four, and W. Gallacher was returned as Communist.

Judging from the votes of certain candidates who had stood prominently against the idea of military sanctions and war (e.g., Mr. George Lansbury), their attitude was a decided asset with the electors, who are not enamoured of the Labour Party policy of backing the League, if need be, to the point of war.

The three Douglasite, Social Credit candidates did not do well. Perhaps even sympathetic voters are awaiting developments in Alberta before throwing over Labourism or Toryism for Douglasism.

The Co-operative Party put forward 20 nominees, running as Labour and Co-operative candidates, and nine were returned.

Summing up the whole situation, Socialists perceive that the task before them is a huge one, but time and circumstances are on our side. The Labour Party has shown the possibility of winning over millions of workers from a traditional Liberal or Tory loyalty to an entirely new political party, claiming to represent the workers specifically. By hard and persistent effort the Labour Party propagandists have taken the separate problems of the workers, hammered out a piecemeal programme for them, and offered it as a solution. Of course, their solution is a wholly mistaken one, but the achievement of winning so large a measure of support is one which should encourage us. What they have done for their mistaken programme we can do for Socialism.

H.

Mine Accidents and Compensation: A Correction

READER has drawn our attention to the statement in the first paragraph of the article, "The Greater War" (see October "S.S."), and asks if it is correct that mine disasters, "substantial enough to be classed as 'Acts of God' . . . absolve the colliery proprietors from liability for compensation." On making inquiries we find that it is not now correct.

The writer of the article, who based his statement on the common assertion of miners, has now consulted officials of the Yorkshire Miners' Association. From them he learns that prior to the Compensation Act of 1908 it was no uncommon thing for explosions to be classed by Coroners' Juries as "Acts of God," owing to the magnitude of the occurrence. In such circumstances the proprietors declined to indemnify the relatives and dependants of those killed or injured. Since 1908, however, the companies are usually insured, and the only cases of non-payment are where the mine company, not being insured, goes bankrupt, and the men are not quick enough to put in a claim by the legally recognised date.

The writer explains that the wrong impression

is very widespread in the mining area where he lives.

This correction does not touch the main point of the article, that the drive for profit is at the bottom of the "accident" rate. The writer sends a cutting from the *Sheffield Independent* (November 6th), containing a report of an inquest at Barnsley on the 19 victims of the North Gawber Colliery disaster. The Coroner (Mr. C. J. Haworth) said:—

We cannot shut our eyes to the fact that explosions due to shot-firing do take place from time to time. The obvious thing to say is that precautions should be taken, and I am going to ask you to recommend that the whole question of shot-firing should be drastically reconsidered. I am not talking about this pit, but pits generally.

With intensive mining of to-day there are certain dangers which would probably not have existed some years ago.

If you are going to have this speeding-up and the advancement of the face very much faster than before, I think it is exceedingly necessary that the whole question of the regulations, especially with regard to ventilation and shot-firing, should receive the most serious consideration of the authorities.

I ask you to support me in putting forward to the Mines Department that the overhauling of the regulations for shot-firing should be seriously considered.

ED. COMM.

The Press and the Election

THE Beaverbrook and Rothermere Press played its usual game in this election. The formula is simple. Between elections Rothermere's *Daily Mail* attacks the Conservative or National Government bitterly from one quarter while Beaverbrook's *Daily Express* attacks it from another—right up to election time. This enables them to influence the policy of the Government and the party, and get measures through suitable to their ideas and the interests they represent. It also leaves them free to repudiate responsibility for unpopular Government policy and to take up every variety of stunt, from Fascism (Lord Rothermere) to nationalising the banks (Lord Beaverbrook). Then, when the election comes round, the joint Beaverbrook-Rothermere Press rallies round the Government candidates, still waving the flag of independence which has facilitated their duping of the readers.

Observant readers will at once notice that this policy of the Press Lords is very much the same as that of the I.L.P., the Communists, and the Socialist League. The I.L.P. and Communists helped build up the reputations of MacDonald, Snowden, and company, and helped them to power, but repudiated all responsibility for their actions. The same will happen again with any future Labour Government.

One curiosity of the campaign was the *Sunday Referee*. That journal, which boasted of its independence, its open forum, and its non-party policy, was much admired by "left-wingers," because it was "different." When the election came round the *Referee* announced that it "is the only national newspaper that is free of Party Politics," and that it believes in the League of Nations, "Pensions at 60," "Nationalisation of the Mines," and "Cheaper Money."

Mr. Isidore Ostrer explained in the *Referee* (November 10th) that by "cheaper money" he means the abolition of usury, and that on this question, which he regards as fundamental, "there is no difference between the parties." Then, with a logic all its own, the *Referee* plumped for the National Government, which, it will be noticed, is not in favour of pensions at 60, nationalisation of the mines, or the abolition of usury. To cover its open support of capitalism, the *Referee* threw up a smoke-screen in the form of an attack on the *Daily Herald*, because it, too, is alleged to be lukewarm about the useless proposal of nationalising the mines.

P. S.

DANCE AND SOCIAL

A Dance and Social will be held at the Express Dairy, Charing Cross Road (opposite Alhambra), on Saturday, December 14th. Admission 1/6. Tickets from Branch Secretaries.

SAILORS DON'T MATTER

"The bows of the *Napier Star* had ripped through the bows of the *Laurentic* into the quarters of the crew, where a score of men were sleeping. How near disaster came to catastrophe was also evident. Had the *Napier Star* struck twenty yards further astern she would have cut clean into the first-class staterooms."—From the news.

If you are thinking of becoming a journalist, child, always remember that when death comes to an ordinary sailor it is mere disaster. When it comes to first-class passengers it is a catastrophe.

—(*Sunday Express*, August 25th, 1935.)

SOCIALIST PARTY OF CANADA.

Head Office and Headquarters of the Socialist Party in Canada, 194, Market Avenue, Winnipeg, Man.

Will all those interested in the development of a revolutionary Socialist Party, and desirous of obtaining further information, write to the official Secretary, F. Neale, 179, Bannatyne Avenue, Winnipeg, Man.?

Those requiring books or pamphlets on Socialism, or wish to subscribe to the *SOCIALIST STANDARD*, official organ of the S.P. of G.B. (subscription rates, 75 cents a year), write to Literature Agent, c/o F. Neale, 179, Bannatyne Avenue, Winnipeg.

SUNDAY EVENING LECTURES

at 42 Great Dover Street, S.E.1, at 7.30 p.m.

- | | | |
|--------|--|-------------|
| Dec. 1 | "Who is the Enemy?" | E. HARDY |
| 8 | "Are Socialists Opposed to Russia?" | ROBERTUS |
| 15 | "The Super State—Labour, Fascist, Bolshevik" | A. KOHN |
| 22 | "International Situation" | C. LESTOR |
| 29 | "White Man's Burden" | G. CLIFFORD |
- Admission free. All invited. Questions and Discussion.

BLOOMSBURY.

Lectures will be given on Monday evenings at A.E.U. Hall, 39, Doughty Street (Corner of Guildford Street), W.C.1. at 8.30 p.m.

- | | | |
|--------|---|-----------|
| Dec. 2 | "Some Modern Problems—The Socialist View" | E. HARDY |
| 9 | "The Mock Battle in Parliament" | S. RUBIN |
| 16 | "Flashlights on the Far East" | C. LESTOR |
| 23 | "Will Society Collapse into Barbarism?" | A. KOHN |
| 30 | "The Economic Basis of Crime" | M. BARITZ |

"The Socialist Party of Great Britain and Questions of the Day"

Deals with the founding of the Socialist Party, the Liberal, Tory, Labour and Communist parties and the I.L.P., the Russian Dictatorship, War, Trade Unions, Social Reforms etc

80 Pages—Price 3d. (Post free—4d.)

Outdoor Propaganda Meetings

DECEMBER

Sundays:		1st	8th	15th	22nd	29th
Regents Park	11.30 a.m.	Ginsberg	Isbitsky	Turner	Clifford	Cash
Finsbury Park	11.30 a.m.	Godfrey	Reginald	Cash	Goldberg	Ginsberg
Cock Hotel, High St., East Ham	8 p.m.	Wiltshire	Cash	—	—	—

Saturdays:

Roper Street, High Street, Eltham	8 p.m.
West Green Corner...	8 p.m.

Wednesdays:

Highbury Corner, N.	8 p.m.
Avenue Road, Clock Tower, Lewisham	8 p.m.

Thursdays:

"Salmon and Ball," Bethnal Green, E.	8 p.m.
--------------------------------------	--------

BRANCH DIRECTORY

BATTERSEA.—Sec., 2, Hanbury Road, S.W.11. Branch meets Thursday, 8.30 p.m., at The Waiting Room, Latchmere Baths, entrance in Burns Road.

BIRMINGHAM.—Sec., E. Jesper, 38, Rollason Road, Erdington, Branch meets Jeans Café, Newton Street. First Wednesday in month at 8 p.m.

BLOOMSBURY.—Branch meets every Monday at 7.30 p.m., at A.E.U. Hall, 39, Doughty Street, W.C. (Near Grays Inn, Road.) Sec., S.P.G.B., 39, Doughty Street, W.C.1.

CENTRAL.—Membership obtained only through the Ex. Committee. Applications to General Sec.

CHISWICK.—Branch meets Fridays, 8 p.m., over Restaurant, 452 High Road, Chiswick, W.4. Communications to Sec., C. Curtis, 52, Parkstead Road, Putney, S.W.15.

DAGENHAM and ROMFORD.—Branch meets alternate Wednesdays, from Dec. 11th, over "Ralphs Cafe," 7 Broadway, Chadwell Heath. Discussion after business. Communications to Sec. 5, Cannington Rd., Dagenham, or P. Golding, "Besra," Boscombe Avenue, Hornchurch.

EAST HAM.—Branch meets every Thursday at 8 p.m., No. 2 Room, London Co-op., 16, High Street North, E.6 (side entrance), Lloyd Road. Discussion after Branch business. Communications to A. Collins, 206, Kempton Road, E.6.

ECLES.—Branch meets 1st and 3rd Mondays in month at Railway Temperance Room, Four Bridges, Wellington Road, 8 p.m. Discussion after Branch business. Non-members invited. Secretary, Mrs. F. Lea, 5, Gaskell Road, Eccles.

EDINBURGH.—Communications to Sec., D. Lamond, at 15, Barclay Place.

GLASGOW.—Branch meets every Tuesday at 7.30 p.m. at McLean Memorial Hall, Salt Market, Glasgow. Communications to J. Higgins, 18, Balfair Street, Glasgow.

HACKNEY.—Branch meets Friday, 7.30 p.m., at Old Gravel Pit Hall, Vallette Street, E.9. Lecture after each meeting. Communication to Sec., E. Chalkley, 21, Bridge Street, E.9.

HAMILTON.—Branch meets every 2nd and 4th Wednesdays of the month in McIntyre's Hall, 151, Lowwaters, at 7 p.m. Communications to T. Jones, 47, Hillside Crescent, Hamilton.

ILFORD.—Branch meets Mondays at 8 p.m. at 142, Richmond Road. Discussion after Branch business. Communications to Sec., at above address.

ISLINGTON.—All communications to F. W., 92, Wellington Road, Holloway, N.7. Branch meets on Fridays at 8 to 10.30 p.m., at Room 4, Co-operative Hall, 129, Seven Sisters Road, N.

LEYTON.—Communications to Sec., Dick Jacobs, 12, Clifford Rd., Walthamstow, E.17. Branch meets Thursday, 8 p.m., at Trades Hall, Grove House, High Road, Leyton.

LEWISHAM.—Branch meets Thursdays, at 8 p.m., at The Anchor Club Room, Lewisham Road. Sec. N. Taylor, 6, Hawke Road, Upper Norwood, S.E.19.

MANCHESTER.—Branch meets 2nd and 4th Mondays each month at 8 p.m., at Craigwell Cafe, Peter Street (entrance in South Street). Public invited. Sec., C. Drew, 84 Avon Road, Burnage, Manchester. Lectures every Sunday evening, at 7.30 p.m.

PADDINGTON.—Branch meeting held on 2nd Friday each month, at 8 p.m., in the guild room over "Co-op. Stores," 447, Harrow Road, W.10. Literature Sec., W. Veal, 73, Wornington Road, W.10. Discussion on 4th Friday.

SHEFFIELD.—Sec., B. Osborne, 8, Fowler Terrace, Sheffield, 3. Branch meets alternate Mondays, 7.30 p.m. at Room 2, A.E.U. Institute, Stanley Street. Meeting on 7th October.

SOUTHEAST-ON-SEA.—Branch meets on first and third Wednesday at 8 p.m., at 6, Hermitage Road, Westcliff. Discussion after branch business. Non-members invited. Communications to Sec., at above address.

SOUTHWARK.—Branch meets Fridays at 8.30 p.m., 42, Great Dover St., S.E.1. Communications to Sec., at above address.

STEPNEY.—Sec., H. Solley, 28, Gore Road, Victoria Park, E.9. Branch meets on Fridays, at 8 p.m., at Working Lads Institute (nr. Whitechapel Station).

TOOTING.—Branch meets 1st Sunday in the month, at 12 o'clock noon. All communications to H. E. Hutchins, Sec., 174, Haydons Road, S. Wimbledon, S.W.19.

TOTTENHAM.—Branch meets 1st and 3rd Fridays in the month, 7, Bruce Grove, Room 2. Discussion after branch business. Public invited. Communications to C. Godfrey, 49, Napier Road, Tottenham, N.17.

WEST HAM.—Sec., P. Hallard, 22, Colegrave Road, Stratford, E. Branch meets Whitehall School, Parliament Place, Forest Gate, every Thursday at 8 p.m.

WOOD GREEN.—Communications to Sec. at 44, Boreham Road, Wood Green, N.22. Branch meets 2nd and 4th Wednesday in month at 8.30 p.m., Stirling House, Stuart Crescent.